DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 313 HE 023 503

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Hively, Robert, Ed. |
| TITLE | The Lurking Evil: Racial and Ethnic Conflict on the College Campus. AASCU Issues. |
| INSTITUTION | American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C. |
| REPORT NO | ISBN-0-88044-122-4 |
| PUB DATE | 90 |
| NOTE | 135p.; Based on the Conference "The President's Role in Creating a Healthy Campus Racial and Ethnic Climate" (Washington, DC, October 10-11, 1989). |
| AVAILABLE FROM | American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle/Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036-1192 ($15.00 members; $18.00 non-members). |
| PUB TYPE | Books (010) -- Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Administrator Role; *Change Strategies; Demonstrations (Civil); Educational Environment; Educational Planning; Ethnic Discrimination; *Ethnic Relations; Higher Education; Models; *Prevention; Problem Solving; Racial Discrimination; *Racial Relations; *Violence |

ABSTRACT

This publication represents the views of a group of university presidents who met on the White House grounds and at the National Capital to survey the rise in violence in all American universities and to assist in appraising and solving the pressing problems that arise from racial and ethnic tensions on the country's campuses. Titles and authors of individual papers include: "Spirit of a Campus" (Anthony Ceddia); "Washington Forum on Campus Violence: Some Points of View" (Robert Hess); "The College as a Racial Model for Society" (Jimmy Jenkins); "The Identification and Elimination of Subtle Forms of Discrimination on the College Campus" (John LaTourette); "Extinguishing at the Flashpoint" (Craig Willis); "A Case Study of the President's Role in Creating a Healthy Racial/Ethnic Climate" (Kenneth Shaw); "Recruitment of Underrepresented Faculty and Administrators" (James Rosser); "A Case Study: Campus Action and Video Film, 'Still Burning'" (Michael Hooker); "A Design for Diversity: Proactive Planning to Reduce Ethnic Tensions and to Enhance Human Resources" (Eugene Hughes); "Preventive Planning at the System Level" (Bruce Johnstone); "A Model: A University's Strategies and Actions from 'Sit-In' to Resolution" (Donald Gerth); "Strategies to Accommodate Change" (John Welty); "Ethnically and Racially Diverse Faculty: A Response to Change" (Dale Nitzschke et al.); "Suppression and Controls on American College Campuses" (David Tatel); "The First Amendment and Racial Harassment on Campus: A Selective Bibliography" (David Tatel et al.); and "Now Liberals Are Censors" (George Will). (JDD)

# The Lurking Evil:
# ıcial and Ethnic Conflict
# - the College Campus

ISSUES

ED319313

HE023 503

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Center for Educational Opportunity and Achievement

# The Lurking Evil: Racial and Ethnic Conflict on the College Campus

Robert Hively
Editor

American Association of State
Colleges and Universities

© 1990 by American Association of State
Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-1192

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

The Lurking evil: racial and ethnic conflict on the college campus/
American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
p. cm.—(AASCU issues)
Contributions prompted by a meeting of selected university presidents held in Washington, D.C. Oct. 10-11, 1989.
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN 0-88044-122-4
1. Universities and colleges—United States—Security measures—Congresses. 2. Violence—United States—Congresses. 3. Discrimination in education—United States—Congresses. I. American Association of State Colleges and Universities. II. Series.
LB2866.L87 1990 90-33870
378.1'981—dc20 CIP

## Contents

Foreword **1**
*Allan W. Ostar*

Introduction **5**
*Robert W. Hively*

Spirit of a Campus **11**
*Anthony F. Ceddia*

Washington Forum on Campus Violence:
Some Points of View **17**
*Robert L. Hess*

The College as a Racial Model for Society **25**
*Jimmy R. Jenkins*

The Identification and Elimination
of Subtle Forms of Discrimination
on the College Campus **29**
*John E. La Tourette*

Extinguishing at the Flashpoint **33**
*Craig Dean Willis*

A Case Study of the President's Role
in Creating a Healthy Racial/Ethnic Climate **39**
*Kenneth A. Shaw*

Recruitment of Underrepresented Faculty and Administrators **47**
*James M. Rosser*

A Case Study: Campus Action and Video Film, "Still Burning" **55**
*Michael K. Hooker*

A Design for Diversity: Proactive Planning to Reduce Ethnic Tensions and to Enhance Human Resources **59**
*Eugene M. Hughes*

Preventive Planning at the System Level **67**
*Bruce Johnstone*

A Model: A University's Strategies and Actions from "Sit-In" to Resolution **73**
*Donald R. Gerth*

Strategies to Accommodate Change **93**
*John D. Welty*

Ethnically and Racially Diverse Faculty: A Response to Change **103**
*Dale F. Nitzschke, Betty J. Cleckley,* and *David Satcher*

Suppression and Controls on American College Campuses **111**
*David S. Tatel*

The First Amendment and Racial Harassment on Campus **123**
*David S. Tatel, Jane Bulbin,* and *Barbara Burch*

Now Liberals are Censors **129**
*George Will*

Appendix **133**

# Foreword

Allan W. Ostar
President
American Association of State
Colleges and Universities

University presidents who now direct the affairs of American institutions are on the firing line of many battles that include, as examples, the struggles of diminishing budgets with increasing costs, withdrawal of federal assistance, fading enrollments, expanded demands for services, and the redundant criticism of study commissions and governmental bureaus. With their experience and executive skills, the chief administrative officers of our schools address these formidable challenges with confidence; they are all a part of the accustomed and traditional business of higher education in the United States.

A different and worrisome concern, however, is the specter of a gradual increase of ethnic and racial violence on American college campuses. These eruptions are alien to what we believe is the spirit, mission and conduct of our universities, and we are tempted to deny them and to convince ourselves that our own establishments are free of such dangers.

If, however, we fail to heed the warnings of conflict, we inevitably encourage the threat of explosive violence that can imperil the stability of vulnerable institutions. Unlike the conventional problems of academic administration, these problems of social conflict demand unique evaluations and usually must be met by leaders who have little previous experience in working out solutions.

Culturally bound and socially endemic, the roots of most antagonism in student relationships are brought by student carriers from their home environments to the campus. Embedded attitudes are often intensified by discriminatory acts and policies of faculty and administration, by peer group attitudes and pressures, and extramural influences. To the typical university president the acute problems that can arise from these sociological and psychological complexities emerge from far outside the range of accustomed college and university affairs.

All American university presidents, along with their administrative staffs, face the prospect of a challenge that is not served by experience and tradition. They must blaze their own trails into the maze of racial and ethnic mixes that now populate the college campus.

Recognizing the gravity and importance of the rise of violence in all American universities and the singular problems of

this emergence, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities was pleased to join with the Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice, the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, and the University of Maryland Baltimore County in sponsoring a meeting of invited university presidents on the White House grounds and at the Capitol to explore "The President's Role in Creating a Healthy Campus Racial and Ethnic Climate," October 10-11, 1989. We are particularly grateful to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation for financial support.

The meeting generated a broad survey of reported campus violence, an intense appraisal of causes for ethnic and racial conflict in our universities, and varied recommendations for resolution.

The spectrum of interest was predictable. Member institutions of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities are notably "on the point" in addressing the problems of racial and ethnic abrasion. They have been aggressive and successful in recruiting diverse student populations and reaching out in their constituent areas to achieve the goals of affirmative action. As a result, the campuses of AASCU schools are often models of pluralism while at the same time they are confronted with the pressures that accompany such diversity.

This publication of comments, prompted by the Washington meeting and made by some of the university presidents of AASCU institutions in attendance, provides an abundance of information that can serve all administrators in appraising and solving the singular problems that may arise from racial and ethnic tensions on their respective campuses.

On one item there is total agreement among all observers, particularly among those who have suffered campus violence: prevention must be the goal of every institution. Once violence has erupted, no cure, no remedy, no treatment can totally restore harmony and parity; the scars are always deep and may be lasting. Today, on the American campus, violence is a lurking evil, and as Shakespeare cautioned, "Beware of the asp in ambush." We must capture it before it strikes.

# Introduction

Robert W. Hively
Editor

Recognizing the increasing frequency of incidents of ethnic and racial harassment and violence on the campuses of American universities, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, the Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice, and the University of Maryland Baltimore County, with the financial support of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, invited a selected group of university presidents to meet on the White House grounds and at the Capitol, October 10-11, 1989, to confer on "The President's Role in Creating a Healthy Campus Racial and Ethnic Climate."

The closed-door meeting, providing an off-the-record freedom, predictably provided an opportunity for frank and outspoken discussions of personal and institutional viewpoints, of experienced successes and failures in dealing with the problems of violence, and of differing recommendations for restraining all forms of harassment, both overt and covert.

The interest, intensity, and convictions expressed by all the participants suggested a need for a way to make their observations and recommendations available to the national community of educators and is the background for this publication, *The Lurking Evil: Racial and Ethnic Conflict on the College Campus.*

Following is a list of the principal specific items that captured major interest and discussion during the two-day meeting. The university presidents who attended were invited to develop any of these into expanded statements for publication, and their contributions are the substance of this project. Not all of the discussions of the assembly are listed, of course, but most of the concerns that occupied the conference are included.

- The president of a collegiate institution should have a team of top administrators who are skilled and trained and can act promptly in the event of campus violence and with confidence in their decisions and unqualified reliance on the support of their colleagues. To avoid contradiction and confusion, a single spokesperson must be designated to speak for the institution, reporting only facts and allaying rumor.

- Racial violence on campus is not an exercise in public relations; it is a vital problem for which solutions must be found, however deep in the structure of the institution they may lie.

- Plans and designs to reduce racial and ethnic tensions and prevent violence on campus, to be successful, must have at their core the total dedication of "heart and spirit" of all segments of an institution—administration, faculty, staff, and students. Laws, regulations, and policies can be applicable and effective only if they are supported by unqualified belief and conviction that parities and harmony are first priorities in an institution.

- Identification and elimination of subtle, often covert, practices of discrimination and harassment that are malignant sources of ethnic and racial activism are a necessary part of the prevention of violence on the college campus.

- A president's administrative assistants must collectively exhibit and demonstrate the policies of the institution and the convictions of the chief executive. Often they may be the most immediately visible representatives in the event of campus emergency.

- Specific procedures for dealing with violence on campus should be planned and specified in the same way that responses to cheating, stealing, and other transgressions are codified.

- A cooperative training program to include police of the campus, city, county, and state should be maintained with designed plans for action in the event of violence on campus. How, when, why, is outside help requested by a university president?

- What restrictions can an institution impose to control off-campus interests that may work to stimulate violence and racial and ethnic differences while respecting their freedom to speech and public assembly?

- To what extent can a "Design for Diversity"—with provisions for planned innovations in the curriculum, education of the "majority," including representatives of the press, trustees, alumni, and townspeople—work to reduce violence and racial and ethnic tensions?

- How can a university devise rules and regulations to moderate speech on campus while preserving constitutional freedoms?

- How can the federal government best serve the nation's colleges and universities in the elimination of racism, ethnic conflict, and violence on campus? Should the country's leaders, in the White House and in the Capitol, go beyond avowed support of the laws and vocalize a moral stance to demand that all aspects of racism be eliminated? Should the federal government's power of the purse be used to influence the elimination of racism in the nation's schools?

- How does separatism or visible clustering of like minorities (e.g., the maintenance of a designated student union for blacks or whites or "centers" for ethnic sub-communities of students), affect social harmony on campus? Does support for limited social segregation conflict with designs for enhanced total integration?

- Acts of racial and ethnic violence are: (a) local events on the college campus that can be solved as institutional problems or (b) products of complex national, sociological, and cultural developments that can be beyond the control of institutions and are not properly their individual responsibilities.

- Aggressive recruiting of minorities in faculty and administration will contribute to the elimination of racial and ethnic tensions on campus, as one president said, "when the faculty and administration change, the students change. The staff of an institution is the visible statement of the policy of the institution in its attitude toward minorities."

- What are the effects and dangers of unreported violence on the college campus?

- The legal conflict between an institution's need to control student behavior on campus to prevent violence and the constitutional freedoms of its student-citizens. Universities must be aware that they are at risk if they impose regulations that may be unconstitutional.

- Is racial violence on a college campus evidence that teaching in the institution has failed in its obligation to prepare informed and socially adaptable citizens? Can students be taught effectively in the classroom to reject violence?

- Can the sources of anti-minority attitudes and actions be identified on the college campus and eliminated within the limits of the campus environment?

- There is a necessity of a welcoming and positive awareness of racial and ethnic differences on campus to replace the negative implications of a detached and indifferent acceptance by the majority. Concepts of mere tolerance, however accommodating, should be replaced with an urgency to understand, admire, and appreciate cultural differences. In interracial mentoring should a faculty representative of a majority group try to transport a minority student to the culture of the majority or should he or she try to understand and become more culturally aligned to the minority's culture and assist the student within the strengths and structure of that minority culture?

- Must college presidents prepare to face problems of a "new racism" on the nation's campuses that will be different but comparable in intensities to the strife of the sixties? How critical are the problems of race and ethnic diversity for the college president in the 1990s?

# Spirit of a Campus

Anthony F. Ceddia
President
Shippensburg University
of Pennsylvania

Sociologists, politicians and even some of us in academe will theorize, debate and rationalize for years the reasons why this decade ended in a thrilling triumph of the human spirit as freedom swept through Communist Eastern Europe.

One of the best explanations I have heard or read for these historical changes was given by former Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger in an appearance at Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania. "One of the strongest human aspirations and desires," he said, "is for freedom, and that idea never is really squashed or can be squashed in a people."

It was that universal desire of the human spirit that led this nation through its own free birth and, more recently, to realize that its future lies in recognizing and building upon its cultural, ethnic and racial diversity. Our nation's collective spirit has led us to the hope of fully realizing the dream of equality based in our spirit and our laws, but, unfortunately, that hope is now on the brink of collapse into racial hatred and violence.

To pull back from the edge and avoid calamity, we can take a lesson from the changes in Eastern Europe. We must recognize that a common thread links the cries for freedom that were answered this year with the same cries heard in this nation in the Sixties. The thread is that the human spirit is the key if we are to raise this nation and, in particular, our college and university campuses above the level of hatred and violence we all abhor.

We have seen repeatedly here and throughout the world that neither legislation nor regulation can confine the human spirit in its quest for freedom and dignity. We must realize that no legislation will fully bring freedom and no regulation can mandate acceptance.

In our battle against the new racism plaguing our campuses, it is the "soul" of the campus that will ultimately bring us to where this nation should and must be in our racial and ethnic relations.

As the product of an education at Catholic schools, the soul was a concept I heard much about. While in high school under the tutelage of Franciscans, I realized that the soul was an extension of the self.

When participating in some of the meetings associated with the forum on "The President's Role in Creating a Healthy Campus Racial and Ethnic Climate," I reflected on the concept and

meaning of "soul" as it relates to colleges and universities. Academic institutions have never been just beautiful buildings. They have always been complex human organizations brought to life by the attitudes and beliefs of each member of the campus family.

Throughout my years as a student and my career as an educator, I have always believed that a college or university stood for the best this nation has to offer. When one considers all of the racial and ethnic eruptions on campuses in recent years in the light of our idealism it would seem improbable that these incidents could or would occur in our academic institutions. But we spend more time and more dollars to combat more violence and more discrimination.

In our meeting in Washington, we shared ideas of what needs to be done to solve our problems and shared those strategies we thought to be successful. Government officials talked about what the federal government can or cannot do to help, and it was clear that the current federal role is more reactive than proactive.

Certainly legislation and regulations at the federal, state and local levels can help to set rules and guidelines against these situations and to establish clear legal limits saying that such incidents are illegal and will be punished.

But it is the fact that such incidents are immoral that will eventually be the basic source for solutions. No canned programs, video tapes, policies and procedures can be as effective as the power of the spirit's moral outrage at such incidents. The soul and spirit of an institution are perhaps more important than policies and procedures.

I have long believed that values are caught, not taught. I learned about "soul" through watching my high school Franciscans live their philosophy of giving, supporting and caring for others. It is the spirit of a campus that needs to be enhanced.

The spirit of our campus life and culture is one of our primary responsibilities and one that demands the attention of the entire campus community.

If campus leaders, especially presidents, frequently and forthrightly address the importance of recognizing and celebrating diversity on the campus and do things to visibly support this

celebration, this value soon will be shared by many on campus, especially students.

We have, in too many cases, tried to institutionalize the campus spirit and soul. We have tried to mandate changes through policies and procedures and forgotten that leading by example is the best way to lead. No rule will prevent racial violence if all members of the campus community fail to realize how destructive such acts are to the soul and spirit of the campus.

The adage, "actions speak louder than words," may be the best of the many rules all of us have promulgated to fight this problem. First Lady Barbara Bush knows the lesson. In a recent report in *The Washington Post*, several shopping malls around Washington, D.C. banned Salvation Army bell ringers from shopping areas, refusing them an opportunity to collect during the holiday season and, perhaps more importantly, denying an outlet for the human spirit's great compassion and charity.

When Mrs. Bush heard of this, she visited one of the shopping malls in the D.C. area that did allow Salvation Army bell ringers to solicit funds. At the mall, she promptly walked up to the first bell ringers and deposited a donation in the kettle. No words were necessary to express her beliefs. No rules were needed to force someone to do something. The action of her spirit was all that was needed. Around Washington, the bell ringers were invited back into the malls.

President Bush, by using the Office of the President, can both in words and actions emulate the spirit and soul of his wife by speaking out forcefully and emotionally against racial and ethnic violence on college and university campuses. His words and actions would register significantly on the souls of individuals at all educational institutions.

Leadership requires and demands many things, including taking risks. It is necessary for leaders, from time to time, to take initiatives and make statements which help others clarify their ambiguities, misconceptions and false beliefs.

In the case of racial and ethnic violence, the soul of a college or university campus is what needs to be tended if we are truly to achieve the equity and understanding of what we strive for in our institutions of higher education. The spirit or the higher values we hold so dear should dictate our words and actions and must be

part of any programs that campuses may develop to encourage harmony, equity and unconditional acceptance among all members of any academic community.

# Washington Forum on Campus Violence: Some Points of View

Robert L. Hess
President
Brooklyn College of the City
University of New York

Fifty feet to the east is McDonald's. There a stray bullet killed a Brooklyn College student in 1988, an innocent victim of the drug-related violence that too often threatens life in this city.

Fifty feet to the west is the gate to the Brooklyn College campus. There, in view of all, stands an eye-catching sculpture entitled "Survival." A few months ago it was dedicated to the memory of the innocent victims of Nazi genocide and to the honor of all survivors of human hatred, prejudice and bigotry.

In between stands Hillel House, where a fraternity party recently ended with two Brooklyn College students in the hospital, a full-scale police investigation into bias-related violence, and detention of several young men with previous arrest records. The Jewish community and the entire college population raised an anguished outcry against anti-Semitism and all forms of prejudice and violence.

It seems singularly appropriate that while our campus and community vented their outrage at these vicious attacks, some thirty college presidents attended a two-day conference in Washington, on the White House grounds and on Capitol Hill, with a most timely theme, "Creating a Healthy Campus Racial and Ethnic Climate."

What did we college presidents find out about bias-related violence on college campuses? As expected, questions far outnumbered answers. But, significantly, the university executives in attendance all agreed that primary responsibility for maintaining order and equity in our collegiate communities rests ultimately and always in the office of the president. Regardless of his or her assignments and the delegation of authority to assistants, in the event of crisis it is the president who remains accountable.

Traditionally, our first and customary turn in matters of civil rights is to the federal government where, since the beginnings of the movement in the Sixties, initiatives to compel compliance have been prompt and forceful and combined with zeal and compassion. That seems to have changed, however, as we learned from our first speakers, representatives of the U.S. Department of Justice and its Office of Community Relations who acknowledged that the department currently is concerned only with appraising specific, case by case, charges of legal infringement.

Apparently these agencies currently confine their roles to the narrowest possible definition of enforcement.

Perhaps as a legacy of the Reagan Administration their actions are limited to responding only to what they view as already demonstrated violations of statute with no apparent guidance by either the spirit of the law or by a broad concern for human relations among Black, Hispanic, Asian, Jewish, and other minority Americans. The arguments of the representatives of the Department of Justice clearly indicated that their current posture is in no way concerned with investigative venture. If someone can prove that a law has been violated, then, and only then, will the Department of Justice consider action.

Our Department of Justice, in this view, does not interpret the law according to the intent and spirit of legislation, nor does it see justice as a process of investigating and securing equality for those who may be denied or persecuted; rather, it apparently wishes to serve in matters of civil rights as a grievance board where it can judge and deliberate on the merits of specific charges of violations. For the present we must conclude that federal agencies will not, beyond "reading the law," be vigorous or zealous in the detection and pursuit of propagators of ethnic violence or in the protection of hard-won civil rights by minorities or in supporting guarantees of those good old American values of life: liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for every citizen.

Additionally, we learned rather quickly in subsequent discussion that those "good old American values" have not been inculcated in a significantly large part of a whole generation of students. In Bensonhurst and in the Hillel incidents attackers were teen-agers or young men in their twenties. In similar offenses elsewhere, assailants have often been of blue-collar background with ..o college exposure; often they have been high school students or graduates but not identified as "dropouts." Contrarily, on large college campuses such as those in Michigan, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin, middle-class college students themselves have been responsible for violence, persecution and intimidation. The assailants in our institutions cross the broad social spectrum of young America. Sadly, along the way they did not adopt what we assume to be our American values.

A sobering reminder came to us from one of the nation's leading legal experts in matters of the First Amendment who patiently explained how freedom of speech has been interpreted by the courts to include freedom to use speech for racial, ethnic, and religious slurs. Few institutions have escaped the trauma of hate-filled graffiti, threatening anonymous telephone calls, and the taunts of those who abuse freedom of speech in their efforts to humiliate. Many attempts to restrict biased or aggressive speech on college campuses have been ruled unconstitutional by the courts; certainly, we can expect that any parochial attempts we make to prohibit and regulate expression may be challenged.

For ten years now Brooklyn College has been actively and aggressively pursuing a policy of cultural diversity and respect for the individual. Student leaders are actively encouraged to enroll in a special course focusing on contemporary campus life. Black and Jewish leaders cooperated on Ethiopian famine relief. Offensive graffiti, once abundant, are removed as quickly as possible after they have been reported. The annual winter carnival in the Catskills has become multi-racial. When the student newspaper published adolescent humor that some perceived to be racist or sexist or anti-Semitic, the student body as a whole voted to remove funding from the offending paper. Students of all backgrounds have worked together to help the homeless. The fifty-year-old tradition of a Country Fair has evolved into a spring celebration of the diversity of a student population drawn from more than fifty ethnic, cultural, racial, and religious backgrounds. Since the college adopted its core curriculum in 1981, every undergraduate is required to take a course in cultural pluralism. Required courses in history, the social sciences, and literature now include materials beyond the traditional texts of our Western heritage in recognition of the diversity of campus and community. Workshops designed to identify and reduce prejudice have been enthusiastically attended by students of all backgrounds.

Yet we know at Brooklyn College that all this is not enough. When students arrive on campus, they bring with them the sensitivities and the insensitivities of home and neighborhood, the pride and prejudice of race, religion and ethnicity, all too often in isolation from those of other backgrounds. Non-Jewish students find it difficult to understand that for many American Jews

the Holocaust has an immediacy and a personal reality that has endured long after the flames of the crematoria were extinguished. Non-Black students find it difficult to understand that for many American Blacks the centuries of slavery and degradation still have an immediacy and a personal reality that have endured long after the shackles were removed and the stage was set for the triumphs of the Civil Rights Movement. Non-Hispanic students find it difficult to understand that for many American Hispanics the legacy of colonialism and the persistence of neocolonialism also have an immediacy and a personal reality that have endured and will probably be intensified as preparations mount for the 500th anniversary of Columbus' landfall in this hemisphere.

From the White House and Bensonhurst, from Capitol Hill and Hillel Place, from Midwood and the Midwest, from Brooklyn's neighborhoods and the country's college campuses, evidence emerges that we, as a nation, are losing a national consciousness that assumes justice, equality and opportunity for all of our citizens.

What is needed is a coordinated campaign to promote the basic human values that all decent Americans really believe in, at all levels, from nursery school to the college campus, in church and synagogue, on editorial pages and in feature articles, on television and in public service advertisements. Basic values such as respect for the dignity of the individual are not transmitted from generation to generation merely because they are incorporated in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Such a campaign must be more than a "promotion," more than slogans. We may have to reawaken the soul of the American population, including all of its formidable ethnic mix, to convince our people that our ideals and the spirit as well as the letter of the law must prevail over the evils of bigotry. The future of the United States, as a people and as a nation, depends upon what we do to preserve the dignity and protected freedom of all of our citizens.

What is needed is a national environment that clearly reflects our traditional ideals and upon which national policy should be developed. The major elements of that national policy should be enhancement of opportunities lest those without opportunity lose hope. This means promotion of economic availa-

bilities with jobs that provide employees with self-respect and a stake in our national development. This means housing that promotes a sense of belonging and community responsibility in contrast to the alienation of the ghetto and the slums. This means development of national social policies that will strengthen the bonds of the family and support our churches, synagogues and other voluntary associations.

What is also needed is a means to provide outlets for the youthful energy that turns too easily from suppressed anger to hatred and from frustration to violence. Let the schools look back to their past successes, when young men and young women were given gratification and motivation not only in academics, but also in athletics and after-school sports activities, and in the joy that comes from participating in the performing arts. While suburbia's rich offerings of youth activities may not meet all of urban youth's needs, certainly involvement in those activities provides a healthy outlet for energies during the most tumultuous years of adolescence and early adulthood.

What is also needed is the sober recognition that limitation of free speech is not the path to take in order to protect our other freedoms. After all, freedom is indivisible. What I suggest then is the development of a deterrent to bias-related physical and verbal assaults. Until now we have looked to legislation and the prosecution of civil rights cases as a deterrent. Frankly, that has not worked as planned. Why not turn to other areas of the law where there exists proven protection and where the potential deterrence effect is worth exploring?

Bias-related physical and verbal assaults humiliate the victim of prejudice. That is a known effect on college students who have been the target of racial or religious hatred and who often go through a tremendous amount of anguish and self-doubt. This suggests another path of action: will aggressors be so ready to act out or to speak up if the potential victims of attack respond with a civil suit for the mental anguish caused by their actions and words? Will the bigots be so ready to act out or to speak up if the victims of such attacks win damages caused by the brutality of bias? Perhaps a few such cases, which I am sure the media would publicize, would cause people to think twice before jeopardizing the possession of their own property, otherwise protected by the

law. Perhaps a few public interest lawyers and a few test cases might provide a way so that the victims of bias-related violence and speech and society at large could end the feeling of helplessness in the face of the outrages we witness too often in this "Land of the Free."

During the two days of our forum we were made intensely aware of the increasing incidence of violence and harassment on university campuses and the inescapable responsibility imposed on every college president to eliminate public expressions of bigotry, hate and discrimination in his or her institution. Admittedly, identifying the responsibility is only a beginning, but the determination and urgency exhibited in the Washington forum give strong evidence that America's university presidents are alert to the prospects of violence in their institutions and are determined to effect its suppression.

An inescapable conclusion that emerged was that no "quick fix" can or will be available to eliminate the causes of ethnic violence and harassment on our campuses. With prejudice and bigotry often rooted deeply in many young Americans, only a slow, patient and effectively planned educational process can alter their hostile tendencies.

# The College as a Racial Model for Society

Jimmy R. Jenkins
President
Elizabeth City State University (NC)

During the last decade, reports of racial and ethnic violence on college campuses and across America have been on an alarming rise. Because the events of the civil rights movement of the Sixties remain vivid in the minds of many Americans who have assumed victory over racial discrimination, recent eruptions of ethnic conflict have come as a surprise to educators, who respond as though each incident is separate, unrelated and local. To the contrary, however, what we see is a part of a national dynamic.

To explain why the frequency of racial clashes is increasing, some experts have suggested the pressures of economic competition between whites and African-Americans in a sluggish economy. Others point to former President Reagan's alleged insensitivity to racial issues, reflected by the diminished authority of the Office of Civil Rights to enforce compliance, and his reduction of federal programs established to provide opportunities to African-Americans. Others simply profess ignorance. They do not know why; they know only that it is happening.

Although many positive changes have been made as a result of the enactment and enforcement of civil rights laws, it is apparent today that the intensity of discord between the races has not vanished. When we view what is the major threat to the stability of this country (the lingering two Americas—one white and one black), in the context of our efforts to find solutions to other threatening, serious problems: e.g., the pollution of our planet, the spread of AIDS, the increasing threat of cancer, and the effects of drug abuse, it is clearly apparent that we must attack racial discrimination in a more creative way. We cannot remain a divided nation where we concentrate more on the color of a person's skin than we do on the person.

We must come to understand that America is unlike any other country in the world. It is uniquely a country populated by increasing densities of Native Americans, English Americans, Spanish Americans, Italian Americans, German Americans, African Americans and how many "Other-Country" Americans?

The increase of racial confrontations on college campuses, if allowed to continue, will contribute not only to a reduced quality of education in our colleges and universities; it will diminish our capacity to develop our future leaders and threaten our readiness

to deal effectively with other concerns, global and domestic, that are imminent dangers.

It has been estimated that by the year 2000 America will be a nation in which one of every three will be people of color. During a period when the number of college graduates is expected to decline, our future leaders will be drawn from the total spectrum of our diverse population. In the very near future, minorities and women will represent over 50 percent of the labor supply. A recommitment to affirmative action in our colleges is not only the right thing to do; it is necessary, if we are to prepare a competitive work force.

To maintain and strengthen our position in the world, and prepare for more critical situations that may become a threat to our nation, e.g., the unification of Europe and the escalating economic growth of Japan, we will need the best of what America has to offer and produce—the best of our minds. We must look beyond skin color and ethnic identification to prepare our leaders and our people—all of us.

Our natural tendencies are shaped to a great extent by our environment, and we must work to develop an environment that nurtures a development of all our population.

For example, the negative impact of television programs depicting conflict between the races, self-centered competition, dysfunctional black families, along with the high unemployment, and growing high school dropout rates of black youth, support stereotypes and exacerbate racial differences and tensions.

A positive view would, in contrast, emphasize harmonious social interaction between people of different cultures. Attention would be given to a productive relationship with mutual respect and appreciation for the contributions of diversity. A positive view can foster harmony in a society where black and white and red and brown and yellow are rewarded for their capacity to think, feel, and act productively and morally.

An irony is that a significant part of our solution is very simple. The challenge is the will of our people to, as Spike Lee puts it, "Do the Right Thing." Why should we as a nation yield to spending billions of dollars annually on social and law enforcement programs designed to treat symptoms of disease, rather than the cause? Just as the energy of Jim Crow laws created

generations of crippled minds and disadvantaged people, there must be an equal amount of energy exerted to reverse the damage. A law of nature speaks to the fact that for every action there is an opposite and equal reaction. For the energy of Jim Crowism exerted yesterday, we must have an opposite and equal amount of energy exerted today.

The common sense behavior of human beings is often dictated by the philosophy of not hearing what people say, because their actions speak so loudly. It is difficult for young people to totally embrace the words of the President of the United States, as he speaks on equality and justice, when his appointments and personal practices reflect a status quo; it is difficult for young people to follow a popular, polished, evangelistic crusade, when the organization of people who surround the evangelist looks no different from corporate America; and it is no long lasting consolation to students of a college or university, who gather around a college president when he or she attempts to provide them comfort from racial attacks, to know that the institution, by acts of the faculty and administration, is guilty of the tokenism that prevails in much of America today. Bold steps must be taken to create models that can teach by example.

Gaining control of race relations in the United States is possible and necessary. As changes in the world community evolve and are planned, America must replace old attitudes and behavior with new attitudes and new behavior, that will ensure harmony and parity for all of our people.

# The Identification and Elimination of Subtle Forms of Discrimination on the College Campus

John E. LaTourette
President
Northern Illinois University

31

The presence of subtle forms of discrimination, especially when they are pervasive, creates an environment in which more overt acts of discrimination can be explosive. Over time, repeated acts of subtle discrimination convince the "victims," as well as a variety of interested "witnesses," that the university is inherently discriminatory and that a condition of "institutional racism" prevails on campus.

In this environment, only one flagrantly discriminatory act can rally a significant segment of the community. A single incident, revealed and clearly defined, exposes the entire institution as a justifiable target. In many cases, these circumstances prompt the establishment of task forces, recommendations for major changes in policies or programs, and university commitments to do everything possible to advance the interests of the aggrieved group. The parties then settle down, and the university returns to its routines. Unfortunately, the pledges of action and promises of new programs, even when fully implemented, seldom address the condition of the basic institutional environment. The underlying fabric remains unchanged, covert discrimination continues, and the stage is set for the next outbreak.

If colleges and universities are going to eliminate subtle forms of discrimination (and in order to make a critical difference on campus, they clearly must), they are going to have to find ways to change hearts and minds. Since a college education is supposed to have some impact on such personal development, one would assume that colleges and universities might be more successful in this area than they have been. Yet many institutional presidents believe that racial and ethnic tensions on their campuses are worsening, and almost all believe that major efforts will have to be made to reverse this trend. Few know precisely what to do. In many ways, we are better at reacting to racial and ethnic violence than we are at preventing eruption and tension. Violence, of course, is illegal, and the right to engage in it has few supporters. When it occurs, most of us can rely on established procedures designed to care for the victim, gather evidence related to the event, identify and detain the victimizer, and provide information to the press and the larger university community.

Racial and ethnic tensions, on the other hand, develop out of actions which, however reprehensible, are not strictly illegal. Such tensions can be fostered in classrooms, hallways, dining halls and sports arenas. They emerge in places presidents rarely travel. Indeed, the presence of a president often leads to unnaturally good behavior, behavior which will disappear the minute the president (or the vice president or the dean) is out of sight or out of hearing. If presidents could watch from some undetected skylight, they would find too many classrooms in which white students are addressed as Mr. Jones and Ms. Smith, while black students, when they are called upon at all, get a nod and a "yes." They would find Asian students whose names have been Anglicized to satisfy lazy Anglo tongues. They would find course after course with reading lists containing no black or ethnic writers. (They should ask themselves, by the way, who the primary black, female and ethnic writers are in their own disciplinary field before they venture into this curricular matter too boldly.) If presidents sat in the stands instead of in sky boxes at their football games, they would hear local fans yell insults at black players on both teams. If presidents ate (incognito) in dining halls, they would see black fans retaliate by pushing through the cafeteria line like a row of enemy tanks.

The activities described above only as examples and indicative of a long list are not illegal, but they are certainly rude and insensitive, and, particularly as they accumulate, they are diminishing. They do not place the minority student in any kind of immediate jeopardy (and thus they do not prompt immediate university action), but they do make the minority student feel like an outsider, an invisible and dispensable person. It does not take many of these activities to create an environment in which a fraternity house skit in black face, a mailing of racial flyers, or a smoke bomb in a minority student's room seems less like an outrage than simply a slight ratcheting up of standard operating tensions. And in an atmosphere like that, a fire or a fist fight or even a riot will seem less astonishing than it should in what ought to be one of the world's most civilized institutions.

But what is a president, who cannot be everywhere and who must depend on the decency and good sense of others in the university community, to do? For one thing, I think a president

can encourage civility on all fronts and applaud it wherever it turns up. By this I mean that it is not enough—indeed it may be counter-productive—to express great indignation over subtle forms of racism and only modest irritation over comparable forms of sexism, ageism or discrimination against persons with disabilities. It is not enough to champion a program in Latino Studies while a program in Black Studies or Women's Studies languishes. If role models are important for one group, they are equally important for other groups. In fact, it is essential that the role model argument not be heard solely as one more element in a panoply of minority support services. Our majority population needs these models as well, because our majority population needs to experience and learn to value the contributions of individuals from a wide range of racial and ethnic backgrounds, individuals of both sexes, individuals at all ages and individuals whose disabilities can be accommodated in the work force.

What else can a president do? I think it is important that presidents attempt to make progress on these matters in times of peace—in times, that is, when expanded programs and new initiatives can be sold on their merits. When committees and commissions are established in response to crisis, necessary though this may sometimes be, and when new activities spring up in response to pressure, overdue though these activities may sometimes be, we undermine the value of our actions by making them appear to be pacification measures rather than inherently sensible and desirable educational developments. Far from encouraging greater tolerance and an increased respect for diversity, we lend credence to the notion that the squeaky wheel (or the belligerent student) gets the attention of the administration, and we render ever more cynical other campus groups who have been pursuing equally desirable ends through standard processes.

What does this add up to? Perhaps no more than a plea for rationality and the development of an atmosphere which is genuinely supportive of all members of the campus community. But this would represent significant progress. It would require paying more than lip service to valuing diversity, and it would require that we recognize and reward those who succeed in reducing racial and ethnic tensions as often as we chastise and try to regulate those who increase them.

# Extinguishing at the Flashpoint

Craig Dean Willis
President

Linda Koch
Vice President
for Student Affairs
Lock Haven University
of Pennsylvania

Racial unrest at a major university, a neighbor institution within thirty-five miles of Lock Haven, generated much student attention and interest in conditions affecting minorities on our own campus. At the same time, alerted by the necessity of our taking disciplinary action against a black student, they began to question our judicial policies and proceedings. The disciplined student subsequently filed a complaint with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission that was dismissed for lack of cause, but sparks had fallen and our challenge was to prevent a fire.

Through the efforts of the Black Cultural Society, a series of three open forums was held to identify undergraduate concerns and to develop solutions for detected problems. The attendance at the first meeting included several faculty members, staff from the office of the dean of students, and a representative from the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission.

Attendance diminished during successive meetings, but topics remained fairly similar. Students recalled incidents that had occurred over the past several years in the community and on the campus. They were concerned about the difficulties black and minority students faced in the classroom, charging that some faculty members made decisions on the basis of race, and they argued that the university lacked concern for the problems of black students. Communication between black administrators and faculty about these concerns was also faulted, and discussion at times was pointedly accusatory.

In addition to the three open forums, two programs focusing on racism were held for separate audiences, one a residence hall event and the other a part of the University Women's History Month Program, both designed to attract a wider representation of students. Discussion was open and informal, and students were encouraged to explore their specific problems and possible solutions. In contrast to the forums where faculty and staff attempted to respond to complaints, these meetings invited response, dialogue, and recommendations by students.

The Black Cultural Society leadership continued to meet to discuss what was becoming a serious issue on campus and examine alternatives and solutions. Factions developed, a demonstration was staged, and after considerable discussion, the

leadership, along with influence from other black students, decided to document a list of concerns that reflected what they viewed as the conditions at Lock Haven. The list focused on the need to hire more black faculty members and administrators. For example, students identified a minority recruiter as one position needed immediately. Other positions specifically requested were: a multi-cultural psychologist, a faculty athletic academic coordinator, two black residence hall directors, and black faculty in the fields of history, education and psychology. The students asked that the university make a commitment to the hiring and retention of black faculty by offering underqualified recruits released time to attain appropriate graduate credit for promotion and tenure.

They called for a black instructor to replace a white teacher in a reactivated course, "Racial and Ethnic Interpersonal Skills." Other recommendations included the installation of an optional three-credit course to explore "Black History" that would be a requirement for majors in education, history, psychology, and social science. The updating of periodicals and references in the library to provide more coverage of minorities was also a priority.

Finally, their list contained a recommendation to form an Improvement Association to sensitize the community to the needs of minorities. The association and other programming groups would be responsible for activities in social relations throughout the academic year.

In an effort to respond to the students' concerns, the Black Cultural Society leaders requested a meeting with the president to share their plans. The president invited the vice president for academic affairs, the dean of student affairs, the assistant to the president and the affirmative action officer to participate. The students proposed that a Good Faith Rally be held to emphasize that the university does not tolerate racism and to demonstrate that Lock Haven provides a good climate for minority students.

Plans for the rally were made the responsibility of the affirmative action officer and the dean of student affairs. Students would select speakers and the agenda would be unrestricted. The president of Lock Haven and a member of the Council of Trustees, an alumnus of the university who started the Black Cultural Society, were asked to speak.

The rally was held with 150-200 people attending, including the local media. Six student speakers, the president and the trustee addressed the problems blacks and whites face on campus. The meeting resulted in a commitment to building a future community tolerant of all races, and a document affirming declarations of cooperation was signed by the presidents of the university and the Black Cultural Society. About twenty posters made by students were placed on the steps in front of the speaker's platform. All participating in the rally wore black and white ribbons provided by the resident hall associations and tied together as a symbol of unity. The proclamation, signed by students, faculty and staff, is on permanent display in the dining hall. It states that the university is deeply committed to zero tolerance for racism and that the university is a place for all students to learn and grow. Copies were sent to the chancellor of the state system of higher education, the president of the council of trustees and other university officials.

## Strategy Learned from the Rally

There were many opportunities for the rally to succeed or to fail. Most supportive was the open communication that had been established between the administration and students. During times of racial tension, knowing whom to trust and who really makes decisions is a key to opening doors that can shut very quickly.

Communication must come from the chief executive officer and his/her staff. Confidence in the ability to respond quickly with the courage to sustain a decision that may be controversial is the result of acquiring information from reliable sources. The chief executive officer must be actively involved and cannot stand on the sideline; he or she must be an active, visible leader and participant. The president must also trust the quality of his/her advisers who must be informed in a timely way. It is the president's views and strategies that must be evident to all involved. The president is responsible for identifying the issues that must be addressed, even those that may be embarrassing or unsubstantiated.

Strategies for handling such requests are never in a textbook or administrator's operating manual. The strength of leadership is determinant and there are no formulas or guarantees. For example, a student demonstration of confidence can be a true achievement on campus but perceived by some of the public as a concession. What begins as a positive event can potentially become an awkward situation, and it is difficult to anticipate group reactions and potential community and parental response.

The success that can be gained by endorsing a good faith effort between students and administration derives primarily from the ability to communicate needs, concerns and solutions. Real problems must be recognized and resolutions pursued earnestly. All communication must be tempered with sensitivity and true concern. In short, everyone involved must really care and have common goals representing parity, and certainly have no hidden agenda. There will probably always be a few of faint heart or flinty conviction who cannot be persuaded to accept what they view as rending change, but, fortunately, reason can usually prevail when it is supported by an honest and determined majority.

Knowing whom to trust is a problem faced by both staff and students. In times of crisis or risk, well-known associates may react differently to requests and suggestions. In particular, when race becomes an issue, a tendency to point first to individuals can delay the necessary survey of operative problems and their solutions. The public admission of racial divisiveness can bring immense pressure and apprehension to administrators who are unaccustomed to the spotlight and postpone decisions that should be made promptly. Sensitivity to the potential explosiveness of racial crisis on campus must be the first caution for all involved, staff and students. Trusting individuals who may not be well-known may be a high risk in some situations, and it is often difficult to maintain confidence that events and motives are being accurately and responsibly reported. And it is in this potential maze of doubt, anger, mistrust and embarrassment that the president of an institution must establish clear lines of communication, assert leadership, and make reason rule.

Identifying the elements of leadership that enhance trust and promote a climate with hope for change is the most difficult

objective. Confidence in student leadership and trust in information obtained are part of the chemistry that allows for progress. Creating a healthy environment for racial difference to exist without violent reaction or abusive argumentation is a challenge, indeed, but one that cannot be avoided in most of our colleges and universities. Sharing the vulnerability of any complex problem is a true test of a president and his or her staff.

# A Case Study: The President's Role in Creating a Healthy Racial/Ethnic Climate

Kenneth A. Shaw
President
University of Wisconsin System

The University of Wisconsin System plan known as *Design for Diversity* has achieved considerable recognition among U.S. institutions of higher education for its approach to addressing a number of major problems related to creating a healthy racial and ethnic climate. While *Design for Diversity* is far from the perfect model for all such efforts in the future, a brief history of its development and implementation, and some personal insights, may be instructive for those who are facing similar tasks.

The University of Wisconsin System consists of thirteen two-year centers offering freshman- and sophomore-level instruction, and statewide extension. It represents the state's entire system of public higher education. It does not, however, provide vocational and technical instruction, which is offered by a separate educational organization.

The UW System, like many other American colleges and universities over the past decade or so, has embraced a number of initiatives intended to increase the number of minority faculty and to attract more minority students. For all their good intentions, these efforts have largely fallen far short of their goals.

## Design for Diversity

It was in November 1987 that I first presented a paper entitled "A Shared Commitment" to our board of regents. It provided a detailed overview of the status of minority education and minority faculty and staff in our university system. It also proposed a number of actions that the board might consider to remedy the serious underrepresentation of most minorities—students and faculty—in effect on our campuses.

At the time I presented the paper I said that I hoped the proposals would "stimulate a spirited discussion." However, none of us in system administration was quite prepared for the degree of spirit that resulted.

A suggestion that we provide more scholarship aid to minorities was instantly interpreted by the media as a proposal for "free tuition," a label that interfered with rational discussion for weeks to come. Many people complained that such "free tuition" as a concept was in itself demeaning to minorities. The only positive side to the debate was its visibility. Almost anyone

who had an interest in minority education made his or her views known.

We scheduled a series of public hearings in various communities around Wisconsin, with particular attention to those areas with the greatest concentrations of minority residents. However, even before those hearings began, I had undertaken an ongoing and intensive personal effort to contact individual minority group representatives, opinion molders, and community leaders statewide.

During this same period I spent time with editorial boards of our leading newspapers and reporters who specialize in reporting on higher education—including editors and reporters on papers with primary circulation among minorities. Other members of the UW System administration staff were also instrumental in this period of personal contact, of course, but it was exceptionally important that the president himself take the lead. It was important in order to underscore the high institutional priority we attached to renewed minority initiatives, and to let minority group representatives, community leaders and reporters understand that they were talking to the person bearing ultimate responsibility for success or failure of the endeavor.

We listened. We explained. We modified some aspects of the proposal originally outlined to the regents. We went back on the road over and again to make our case, to listen to the responses, to get a feel for the needs and priorities and the realities. In April, a full six months following my initial presentation, I described our new proposal—now titled *Design for Diversity*—to the board.

The response was overwhelmingly favorable, not only by the board, but by the academic community throughout the university system, and by responsible leaders in every sector of Wisconsin society. Perhaps the most gratifying early result of this effort was an increase the following semester in minority enrollments throughout the university system, even though none of the recruiting activities of the plan had yet been implemented. We had clearly demonstrated that the University of Wisconsin System was dead serious about improving minority enrollment, retention and graduation.

The complete implementation of *Design for Diversity* continues to this day, and will continue for some time into the future.

The document adopted by the regents set policies and goals, but left specific planning, programming and monitoring to the individual campuses. Along the way this process has had its share of triumphs and disappointments, achievements and failures. On balance, the positive aspects have far outweighed the negative.

In the meanwhile, we have gained considerable insight into the perils of such an undertaking, and perhaps sharing some of these now will prevent a duplication of our frustrations by others.

## Faulty Assumptions

A number of assumptions, more or less commonly held among chief executive officers of educational institutions, can lead to unnecessary (and unnerving) complications. Examine your underlying assumptions carefully. Be particularly wary of these:

1. *Doing the right thing ensures that the president will be well-liked and his or her campus will be conflict-free.*
*Fact:* Prison riots start when the food gets better, not when it gets worse. Your good attitude does not guarantee that you will be universally appreciated. The right thing, the moral thing, must be done, but this will not automatically mean that you will be appreciated. You may, in fact, experience greater controversy and some backlash.

2. *Principles of civil disobedience are well understood by the academic community.*
*Fact:* Some such principles are well understood, such as the need to oppose immoral laws and practices. The consequences of such action, however, seem to be forgotten or put out of mind. However, individuals violating laws out of moral conviction should expect to be arrested or otherwise penalized. Our society functions through its observance of the law, and failure to obey—no matter how moral the grounds—carries a price. The extent to which this consequence of civil disobedience is not understood is the extent to which greater disruption is a risk when firmness is applied.

**3.** *First Amendment issues are well understood by the academic community.*
*Fact:* We hear two extremes being argued these days. The first holds: "People have a right to speak, but if it's offensive to me, that right should be withdrawn." Such an attitude is responsible for banning those with unpopular views, such as Louis Farrakhan, from appearing on campus. However, a university must continue to be a place where all points of view can be expressed, and such expressions must be protected. At the opposite extreme we hear: "Anything said is protected by the First Amendment." It is the old question of shouting "Fire!" in a crowded theater. Most of us would agree that such an utterance is not protected by the First Amendment. In drawing up recent changes to our code of student conduct, we took a similar view toward utterances and behavior patterns that are intensely discriminatory. The code now prohibits behavior that would intentionally demean the race, sex, religion, color, creed, disability, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry or age of other individuals. Name-calling is therefore prohibited.

**4.** *The best approach is to do nothing; the concern for equal opportunity is a fad that will soon go away.*
*Fact:* There is an economic imperative at work today that was unrecognized a few years ago. Only a decade from now, one-third of our new labor force will consist of minorities. If these young men and women have not had the opportunity to educate themselves adequately, our entire nation is at economic risk. The pressure for educational opportunity, therefore, will come not only from the minorities themselves but from the business sector and from public interest groups who understand the problem.

## Dealing With Other Problems

As chief executive of your institution you expect to assume a leadership role. *But don't try to do it all!*

You have accumulated a staff of talented and enthusiastic people. Let them help.

First, set the vision.

The UW System *Design for Diversity* is in effect a vision of what we want ourselves to be. It is essential that such a vision come from the top of the institution, that the institution is in fact practicing what it is preaching, and that those who share this vision be equipped with the tools to realize it. This vision must, therefore, be articulated as the very first step. In *Design for Diversity* we spell out goals for increases in faculty, students and staff. We then list a wide variety of "first steps" toward realizing those goals. "First steps" are actions that can be measured. Taking the first step makes it all the more likely that the next step will also be taken.

Next, prepare your staff to deal with problems. Train them in conflict resolution.

I've found these four steps helpful in dealing with conflict.

- *Listen.* Listening gives us information about what is important to other parties. It allows adversaries to relax and focus on solutions.

- *Repeat in your own words what has been said.* It demonstrates that you are listening, that you understand correctly, and that you really care.

- *Indicate where you agree with your adversary.* This eliminates topics you don't need to discuss and creates a good climate for dealing with the real differences.

- *Finally, indicate your areas of disagreement.* Once the issues have been clearly defined you can begin to reconcile your differences, and you have already established the format for their resolution.

There are no shortcuts to creating a healthy ethnic and racial campus climate. There are no assurances that your campus will remain free of conflict. Perhaps you should bear in mind the classic words of Harry Lime, spoken by Orson Welles in "The Third Man": "Decades of warfare and bloodshed in medieval Italy produced the Renaissance. Five hundred years of peace in Switzerland produced the cuckoo clock."

You and I did not enter educational administration because we thought it would be easy. We are here because we believe that our presence could make a difference, that we could institute change for the better.

Creating a favorable campus climate for minority education is one of those areas where you definitely can make a difference. And if, in the process, you are not blessed with peace and contentment, you can be assured that at the least you are not building a cuckoo clock.

# Recruitment of Underrepresented Faculty and Administrators

James M. Rosser
President
California State University,
Los Angeles

The question for the 21st century and beyond is whether we can mature as a nation of immigrants, bound together by the pursuit of a common set of democratic ideals which are exclusively inclusive, or whether we will continue to be driven by a set of descriptors that are embedded in an exclusively exclusive context. How best to continue the search for "truth"—a hallmark of the academy—is better fostered through objective dialogue generated among differing views, but within a common ethic. Until we address this issue objectively through the collective will of our nation, we will continue the illusory pursuit of something called *cultural pluralism* which will continue to be increasingly difficult to achieve. Things do differ more in degree than in kind, and self-criticism is essential to self-renewal.

A self-evident truth is that a nation as diverse as ours needs institutions with an equally diverse faculty. From a tangible perspective, the development, recruitment, retention, tenuring and promotion of underrepresented individuals can be described as a matter of enlightened self-interest. Unfortunately, most current endeavors appear to be more representative of short-term solutions that are hampered by lack of commitment to a shared national perspective. Our long-term success will depend on the manner in which our institutions are characterized—throughout—by an inclusive perspective.

Given the fact that whites hold approximately 90 percent of all faculty and administrative positions in American colleges and universities, white perspectives have enormous salience, with a collective responsibility that cannot be ignored or declined. One of the obvious consequences of this white dominance is that white and nonwhite students are not likely to come into contact with nonwhite faculty. We know that professors can have a significant influence on students' views and their interpretation of important political and social issues. In large part, the students see them as being members of a societal elite supported by their educational achievements and positions. The lack of faculty from underrepresented groups may be misinterpreted by students as evidence of a rejection of those groups as inferior, while taking a course from underrepresented faculty may be one of the best ways for students to overcome misconceptions about the capabilities of

individuals from underrepresented groups. The value of interaction of this kind cannot be overstated.

Stereotypical views about the worth of underrepresented minorities are not limited to students. Faculty may also be susceptible to them.

> *Even at this point in our nation's development, it cannot be denied that there are still whites who prefer not to have a black person as a colleague. Because most white faculty members have had little sustained or significant contact with blacks, they have no direct information that they can use to counter prevailing racial prejudice. Their refusal or inability to move beyond stereotyped ideas about blacks results in a campus climate that minimizes the chances that a black will be hired. Individual prejudice and timidity thus become entrenched as institutional racism.*[1]

When students leave the university, most will enter a world in which they will work and live with persons of all races. If they have spent their time in an environment in which authority and respect are afforded only to professors and administrators who look like themselves, we are not educating our students adequately. We have not given them the opportunity to benefit from the insights of professors and administrators who can better prepare them for living in a pluralistic society.

Another consequence of underrepresentation among faculty and administrators is the lack of appropriate role models from underrepresented groups. It is not uncommon for minority students to report feelings of alienation and isolation during their college experience, and they often go their separate ways, creating a climate that isolates students and reinforces stereotypes. These students often become disconnected from campus life with a consequent decrease in their retention and success rates.

A recent national study examined the ten best examples of minority graduation records from four-year colleges. The project identified key features of institutional environments which produce academic achievement among minority students. Among these were:

- Special efforts by institutions lacking a "critical mass" of minority students to help students become aware of each other and of minority faculty.

- Faculty who display confidence in the ability of minority students to achieve, as they guard against associating deficiencies with ethnicity.

- Special attention to the progress of minority students with intervention as necessary to address disproportionate failures of any group.[2]

Current reality places an added burden on minority faculty in terms of their roles as mentors. They often feel that they must spend additional time providing advising and counseling services to underrepresented students, thereby decreasing their available time to become involved in research, scholarly and creative activities, important factors in evaluation for tenure and promotion. The majority, by force of circumstances, will continue to provide their time and expertise, because they recognize that minority students will suffer if they do not.

There is also a need for diverse student services and administrative staff. Students have some of their most important interactions with these individuals. Another key feature contributing to the academic achievement of minority students identified in the above-mentioned study was advisement and support services that do not assume that all students accommodate equally to the collegiate environment. It is extremely important that these staff members understand and even share the experiences of their students, and that they be sensitive to and knowledgeable about cultural and linguistic differences that may exist.

In short, the quality of education for all our students is enhanced by a more diverse faculty and staff.

California State University, Los Angeles is the most culturally diverse university in California, and probably in the nation. For obvious reasons, it is incumbent upon us to achieve a diversity of our faculty and administration reflective of our student body. The following are some examples of what we are

doing to recruit and retain underrepresented faculty and administrators at California State University, Los Angeles.

First, there is a clear and explicit articulation of the context within which California State University, Los Angeles is pursuing faculty excellence with diversity, inclusive of the curriculum. All members of the university community, including advisory board members, alumni, etc., are encouraged to assist in establishing an environment conducive to retention and continuing professional development. It is expected that this will be acknowledged as a natural characteristic of the campus.

In light of pipeline problems and future needs and demands, early identification and nurturing of pre-doctoral, ABD and post-doctoral students are emphasized.

- The original concept for the California State University (CSU) Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program was developed by California State University, Los Angeles. The program currently has 200 participants, of which 50 are black, 54 Hispanic, 30 Asian and ten Native American.

- Several proactive and creative initiatives to increase the appointment of underrepresented faculty have been undertaken in recent years. School deans have been designated as the school affirmative action officers. This approach has taken a variety of forms, which includes the deans setting the tone for the chairs and encouraging identification of underrepresented candidates for consideration for tenure-track appointments throughout the year. Additionally, the deans encourage departments that have not had an opportunity to hire recently and have more than 80 percent full-time faculty to request tenure-track positions for underrepresented candidates. Further, the deans attend the first meeting of department appointments committees to discuss our affirmative action commitment, which includes interviewing the top three qualified affirmative action candidates and bringing the top qualified affirmative action candidate to campus.

- Clear and explicit information is provided regarding department, school and university policy, procedures and expectations regarding retention, tenure and promotion.

- Favorable packages including moving expenses, start-up equipment, reduced teaching loads, etc., are developed in recognition that we are seeking to recruit and retain current and projected scarce resources.

- Emphasis is given to support that is related to career development for new appointments.

Another significant endeavor has been the Minority Faculty Recruitment Team Program. This program consists of teams of tenured and tenure track underrepresented faculty that visit universities across the country that enroll and graduate large numbers of underrepresented students. The program enjoys outstanding support and has been equally successful. The university director of affirmative action is provided 20 percent of the schools' recruitment funds in support of this and other special efforts designed to assist in hiring and retaining affirmative action candidates.

A side benefit of this program has been the development of valuable relationships with academic administrators and faculty in key universities which have led to the formation of a network that has been able to make continuous referrals of underrepresented candidates. Just as importantly, many of these same campuses are actively recruiting our underrepresented students for their doctoral programs.

- An Underrepresented Faculty Tenure-Track Program has been developed which involves candidates who have not yet completed terminal degree programs in hard-to-hire disciplines; providing a mentor; course-load reduction; and other support as appropriate, to assist the candidate in the timely acquisition of the terminal degree.

- Regular mentoring and networking is also encouraged. Informal meetings are coordinated by the university director of affirmative action.

- The university's commitment to educational equity is emphasized in the guidelines for the allocation of recently established research, scholarly and creative activities funds.

Additionally, educational equity objectives are included in each administrator's work plan and are important elements in performance evaluation. Special efforts to increase the number of underrepresented administrators at California State University, Los Angeles include:

- A campus intern program that identifies and trains high-level clericals for entry-level management.

- Utilization of participants from the CSU Administrative Fellows Program for placement in administrative positions.

- Identification of underrepresented minority staff who could move into interim or acting administrative positions.

- A well-established off-campus network regarding California State University, Los Angeles' interest in placing underrepresented individuals in administrative positions.

- Support for aggressive, creative recruitment to identify and hire underrepresented individuals as administrators.

The limited number of underrepresented persons in faculty and administrative positions decreases the opportunity for the exchange of ideas and opinions. This severely limits the ability to understand and appreciate the richness of diverse cultural perspectives. Colleges and universities must take aggressive action to keep in step with the changing face of our 21st century society, not only for moral, economic and political reasons, but because it is in the best interests of the nation.

## Notes

[1]W. B. Harvey, "Where are all the Black Faculty Members?" *Chronicle of Higher Education.*, 22 January 1986, p. 96.

[2]Richard C. Richardson, Jr. and Elizabeth Fisk Skinner, *Achieving Access and Quality: Case Studies in Equity* (Washington, D.C.: ACE/Macmillan, 1990).

# A Case Study: Campus Action and Video Film, "Still Burning"

Michael K. Hooker
President
University of Maryland
Baltimore County

The history of the University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC) is an exciting story of the development of a metropolitan campus intended to specifically address growing needs of the Baltimore metropolitan area, and, generally, to meet the needs of the State of Maryland. In the twenty-three years since UMBC's establishment, the development of the campus has been both rapid and exciting. However, UMBC's development has also been marred by a history of incidents of racial intolerance. This history began with a decision to locate UMBC not in the city of Baltimore, but in Baltimore County, which is predominantly white. Some of the black political leadership in Baltimore believed that the location was chosen out of fear that the new campus would be primarily black if located within the city limits. As a result, UMBC has always been viewed suspiciously by many in the black community. This suspicion is fueled by a more general suspicion of the University of Maryland system, which practiced *de jure* desegregation until 1954. In fact, Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall was denied admission to the University of Maryland School of Law.

Black students at UMBC experienced or knew of acts of intolerance from the opening of the campus in 1966. Reports of harassment and other acts of racial intolerance became "tradition," sending the message to the outside community that UMBC was a hostile environment for black students; and the hostile racial climate and tensions continued to mount. A strong black student union and other black organizations on campus have consistently, through sit-ins and other demonstrations, placed their issues before each administration. Nineteen eighty-six was a pivotal year in the history of the campus. Concerned students staged a "sit-in" in the president's office to protest the treatment of several black students who lived in the campus residence halls. In general, their complaint was that two students, one black and one white, committed similar offenses. Yet the black student was dealt with more harshly. The other complaint was that the university ignored the complaints of three black students who had been the victims of harassing behavior while they shared an apartment on campus. These issues had been lingering on the campus for almost a year without conciliation or resolution.

I had just taken office as the fourth president of UMBC when the sit-in occurred. I responded to the demands of the students and sought ways to address not only the controversy at hand, but saw that the issue of campus climate needed to be addressed in such a way as to convey a system of values to the campus community which would make acts of intolerance unacceptable at UMBC. Some of our initiatives included:

- The hiring of more minority faculty through more aggressive recruiting and the provision of incentives to departments to hire more minority faculty

- The appointment of minorities to senior administrative positions, including an assistant vice president for student affairs, who works on the campus climate for minorities as part of his responsibilities

- Assignment of resources to provide cultural events focusing on diversity

- The convening of campus forums to discuss and design plans to create a more healthy campus climate

- Implementation of a model which focused on the prevention of acts of intolerance, and included specific measures for addressing acts of intolerance should they occur.

It became obvious through the demonstration period that one of the most important ingredients for a healthy climate was fostering discussion between and among people and groups. Several groups were active on campus either as student groups, advocacy groups, or institutional groups. To make certain there would be a structured, on going opportunity for the officers and leadership of these groups to talk to one another, I created the President's Advisory Committee on Human Relations. The committee may review and monitor all programs in the above areas of recruitment and retention, and initiate ideas and programs to bring deeper understanding and respect for the diversity of our community. I convene the committee quarterly and find it of great

value, not only for me but for the interaction it is producing among UMBC's staff, faculty and students.

Perhaps the most widely known of these efforts is the creation of a videotape, "Still Burning," which was produced by the UMBC police with the assistance of many others on the campus. "Still Burning" contains two parts. Part I speaks to administrators and provides a model for addressing acts of intolerance. Part II shows students who are members of different racial, ethnic, national, religious, and sexual orientation groups. The students speak about how they, as minorities, feel in a majority institution.[1]

From a history laced with the tensions and anxieties created by racial hatred and suspicion, UMBC has emerged as an institution working to create a campus climate which appreciates and celebrates diversity. As I say in the epilogue of the "Still Burning" tape, UMBC is not perfect, but it has been extremely effective in preparing our students for a world of diversity in the 21st century.

## Note

[1]"Still Burning," which has been distributed nationally and presented at national and regional forums, may be purchased by contacting Beverly Roeder at the UMBC Office of Instructional Technology at 301/455-3208.

# A Design for Diversity: Proactive Planning to Reduce Ethnic Tensions and to Enhance Human Resources

Eugene M. Hughes
President
Northern Arizona University

The prospect of racial and ethnic tensions and incidents on American campuses can be alarming. When we view them we should be even more alarmed in our awareness that racial incidents, frightening and consuming as they may be, are only symptoms of underlying social ills. If we are truly perceptive, we recognize that our real infirmities are in the causes of the unrest that bubbles not only in our universities but everywhere in our society.

Injustice, unequal distribution of resources, dehumanization of minority and non-minority populations, misunderstandings, miseducation, and a general late-twentieth-century feeling of helplessness and frustration in what seems to be a prevailing inaction have all left many students, part of a deprived segment of our population, searching desperately for something to believe in. Too often we tell our youth what to "Say No" to, but give them nothing to "Say Yes" to.

In a misguided reaction to the Civil Rights progress of the 1960s and 1970s, we sometimes took a supposedly "color-blind" approach which actually deprived our students of a racially sensitive education. There is much evidence that we have done less than an effective job in educating *about* race and culture. Many institutions have deliberately avoided discussion of controversial issues like racism in their curriculum and student programs, while still seeking to comply technically with the demands of affirmative action.

Because serious study of racial problems is not available in many of our collegiate institutions, students have turned to other sources. Hearsay, television, Hollywood films, and the popular press perpetuate their stereotypes and biased attitudes about race and minority cultures.

In addition, increasing resentment has been generated by administrative misunderstanding and misapplication of affirmative action directives. We are all familiar with stale anecdotes: non-minority individuals with Anglo surnames have been rejected; "technical minorities" alien to actual minority backgrounds and minority individuals ignorant of minority cultures and issues have been actively pursued to satisfy compliance while avoiding a need to accommodate cultural differences; unqualified minority individuals have been hired and marginally qualified

minority individuals retained, with their apparent deficiencies serving to embarrass and irritate minority populations and to deter significant institutional change.

The villain is not affirmative action. Affirmative action was the very instrument created to implement a proactive equitable balance. The villainy lies in its purposeful misuse, and in misunderstandings of its appropriate use. Affirmative action can support aggressive recruitment and advance the changes our institutions most need, or it can be applied passively and without regard to its true purpose, "complying" only in technical specifications that have no purposeful goals. These abuses inevitably take their toll and contribute to frustration and anger, the seeds of violence.

The two factions that divide many of our campuses—one white, one non-white, both often incubating frustration, hatred, and racism—have developed during two decades of "color-blindness," "color silence," and the misapplication of the principles of affirmative action.

Instead of planting the seeds of tension, violence and misunderstanding among ethnic groups, institutions of higher education should use their cultural and racial diversity to teach and guide students to prepare them for living in the inescapable pluralistic society.

We cannot afford any longer to operate with limited or naive definitions of racial insensitivity that euphemistically suggest a tolerance of racial harassment that is nonviolent. Any display of attitude, threat of action, or ambiguous institutional policy that has as its effect the isolation, subordination, or diminution of a person or group of persons on the basis of race, culture, or color, regardless of any stated or implied purpose or intention, reveals a racial insensitivity and is unacceptable.

Failure to make strong and affirmative decisions in crisis becomes a decision, and is always a bad decision. We cannot assume that ignored problems will disappear. We cannot moderate measures of accommodation or recognition of minorities. We cannot pursue any route that does not integrate an intercultural and interracial emphasis in our plans and policies and in our teaching and curriculum.

Leadership must be strong, bold, committed and open to dialogue with the entire campus community. Minority and non-minority contingents, faculty and students alike, must have access to authority and must receive answers to questions and acknowledgment of recommendations. Issues must be addressed; they cannot be avoided.

As observed above, racism and bigotry are not completely local when they erupt on a university campus; they are engendered in our national culture. We are, therefore, not committed to a parochial improvement of minority education, we are obligated to improve the education of a nation's citizenry, opening eyes that need to be opened and empowering voices that need power to effect change.

In the context of these observations, let me suggest some specific recommendations for institutional change, including a few that we have adopted at Northern Arizona University, which in my view are necessary and appropriate to move in the direction of harmonious pluralism and the effective teaching of cultural pluralism on our campuses.

We first need statements of executive leadership that make clear not only our proposed goals in matters of race and ethnic minorities (which may be temporal and subject to change), but also statements that locate programs in our long-term mission as educators—statements that explain not just what we are doing, but also why we are doing it. Without a clear and well-articulated rationale, we risk misunderstanding, resentment or rejection by non-minority populations.

At the same time, we must be aware that minorities may often conclude that policies and programs designed to establish equality and justice identify them in high profile and prompt a feeling of being "done to": as recipients of special and visible attention they may feel demoted and, in comparison with others, dehumanized. Participation, dialogue, and clear, comprehensive and unambiguous statements of strategies and tactics are essential to an understanding and acceptance of interracial and intercultural programs by all students.

Northern Arizona University's statement, *The Vision and the Will*, articulates a rationale and points directions for necessary

institutional change; it is an expression of our vision for the future. I would like to quote from the end of this document:

> We do not see this as a program aimed at minorities; it must be approached as a university-wide effort, aimed at everyone. The issue of diversity is one that is basic within human societies. Diversity provides a richer environment, where creativity and innovation are multiplied by the inherent wealth of diverse perspectives. . . .
>
> We should not focus on the smallest steps acceptable to appease current flares and smooth over the appearances of dissonance, but should focus instead on bold and integrated changes to impact long-term realities.
>
> We have a vision of this society three generations into the future, a society in which diversity—cultural as well as individual, and majority as well as minority (tenuous terms to begin with)—will be utilized toward our mutual enrichment and growth as a society. This is the vision. And this is the will to make bold moves which can transform the vision into reality.

In order to transform that vision into reality, we depend on the cooperative efforts among all facets of the campus and surrounding community. Institutional change needs to progress from the top down, from the bottom up, and from the middle in all directions. As a president, I can give the message about "the top down." I can also lend support and encouragement to projects and concerns that come from the bottom up. It is part of our responsibility as "administrators" to open clear channels so that we may hear these concerns and be responsive to them. One way to make sure this happens is to re-conceptualize our role, seeing ourselves and acting as members of a partnership, a partnership with students, with ethnic communities, and with school districts.

Student organizations are a crucial and valued resource in achieving our goals for diversity. Community organizations and community partnerships also can provide expertise and special support and direction in critical areas to which some of us within the walls of our institutions may be blind.

At Northern Arizona University, for example, we have formalized our partnership with surrounding Indian tribes through a special initiative, "A New Momentum," that builds strong partnerships for mutual educational and economic development. We have developed links with urban schools, whereby we bring in elementary and middle school students who are at risk to a campus environment that was previously alien to them, and we have benefited from the interchange and the learning.

In addition, we have initiated a program that is purposefully non-hierarchical, purposefully multicultural, that draws from all parts of the campus. The Presidential Ambassadors for Cultural Diversity is a group of thirty-five representatives—deans and undergraduates, faculty and secretaries, custodians and graduate students—who bring with them valuable cultural and individual experiences and who have been entrusted to create proactively. They not only provide leadership and direction to the campus, discussing concerns and resolving problems, but also initiate new and positive approaches to ethnic and cultural diversity. A special assistant to the president has the specific responsibility to initiate and plan the cultural diversification of the university.

We have recognized that institutional change at all levels is a necessary part of avoiding racial conflicts and misunderstandings; as a result, all of our administrators, staff, faculty, and students are engaged in training for intercultural awareness and skills. Our cross-campus diversity education for minorities and non-minorities includes campus entertainment, celebrations, even symbols and mascots.

At the same time, cultural diversity must also infuse the more permanent structures and policies of an institution. Core curricula must be integrated and multicultural in perspective. Institutions which do not provide majority students contact with, and learning from, minority students are not educating persons appropriately for the 21st century, and it follows that administrators and faculty should have cross-cultural competencies.

How many astronomers have been extensively trained, but have never seen the heavens from an Aztec's scientific posture? Will they then, by default, continue to present astronomy (or other sciences) as if only those paradigms that originate in

Western civilization are of significance and to transmit simultaneously the message that Western culture alone has made a significant contribution to civilization? Faculty development must be linked to multicultural concerns on campus. Our faculty must be provided the opportunities, tools and the exposure by which cultural perspectives and biases can be changed. And we at Northern Arizona University are exploring incentives, development programs, and job definitions/evaluations that acknowledge our multicultural responsibilities.

And important in this observation is the awareness that we are in a continuing process of exploration. Much of the territory in which we are trying to develop effective interracial policies and programs is unmapped, and often we are seeking and examining options. For example, the accommodation of free speech on the university campus can be perplexing. Student publications that express only Anglo perspectives do not represent adequately the mix of a student population. But when we insist on an open forum of communication that is crucial to racial harmony, we risk an invitation to culturally insensitive messages that cannot be tolerated.

In the event of unacceptable speech, either oral or written, silent non-action suggests a passive endorsement. Draconian controls inevitably bring the charge of suppression and censorship. Can we find a compromise, a mutually acceptable middle ground? An effort to answer this question involves dialogue and dialogue may be the solution to the seemingly imponderable of free speech.

If we can involve the campus community in a continuing examination of the problem, perhaps we are solving it at the same time. To engage in this dialogue effectively, administrators and faculty must be prepared to answer questions and to respond to feelings honestly and sensitively. We should be able to deal with irritating queries such as, "Why is racism wrong?" and "Aren't blacks really inferior anyway?" without emotion or impatience. If we do not or cannot respond honestly and openly, with conviction and a right-headedness about interracial and intercultural affairs, we are failing to educate racially and culturally. And that is a failure that we cannot accept. We must assume the responsi-

bility for that education, although we may sometimes be late and sometimes be at hazard.

Our Arizona Board of Regents, representative of a conservative state, at times has not anticipated many of the racial and cultural realities of the future, but it has taken leadership in emphasizing four aspects of institutional commitment to minority education.

For instance, the Regents' Report, *Our Common Commitment*, has stressed "Early Outreach," where our institutional responsibility is identified as a societal responsibility at all levels, "K" through collegiate. "Recruitment" efforts, "Retention and Graduation," and "Accountability" is a call for us to work toward "a future for the Arizona university system where the strengths inherent in cultural and ethnic diversity are fully integrated into the campuses and where minority students attend and graduate at rates that render the term 'underrepresented' obsolete."

The message needs to go out loud and clear that in each of our institutions we are trying to develop a campus environment in which students from every racial and ethnic background are valued for their unique perspectives and can flourish intellectually and emotionally, culturally and socially. We also need to emphasize that to develop this kind of environment, all components of the campus community—students as well as faculty, custodians as well as deans, and vice-presidents as well as secretaries, townspeople and members of the board—share responsibility and a collective dedication.

The most valuable resource at a university is its diversity of human beings—with their unique cultural perspectives, values and traditions. It must be used to educate. If we can transmit that message to all of our ethnic and racial groups and involve them in the teaching and learning, we will have begun to attack the basic causes of racial and ethnic violence in our nation and on our campuses.

# Preventive Planning at the System Level

Bruce Johnstone
Chancellor
State University of New York

73

Colleges and universities have always been major participants in societal change. For a number of years, we in the academic community have faced the challenge of extending ourselves to heretofore underrepresented populations, primarily by recruiting larger numbers to our campuses. More recently, we have come to realize that recruitment and admissions are not sufficient solutions. Minority students need access to the full personal, social, and intellectual resources of the academic community, and our success must be measured by their retention, graduation, and passage on to advanced professional and graduate studies.

We are realizing, in turn, that our programs must be aimed at *all* students, and that the problems of underrepresentation or racial unrest lie not with the minority students and their too frequently presumed underpreparation, but with the majority students and faculty and staff...in short, with ourselves. Our goal—the creation of a pluralistic learning environment—must be to ensure that *all* students grow personally, socially, and intellectually, and that they develop an understanding and appreciation of different cultures, while meeting graduation requirements and career goals.

While the creation of such a campus environment is everybody's responsibility, it is the president who sets the tone for the campus and who must ensure that the campus actualizes the promises of equal opportunity that are so easily made. The president has many opportunities to set the standard: in his or her charges to and evaluation of administrative colleagues, during meetings with campus governing boards and faculty and student governance organizations, through community and other public contact, in the development of a campus strategic plan, through the development of an annual report that focuses on campus accomplishments and future agendas, in formal and informal communication with the faculty (who must strongly advocate change and play a major role in the process), and in responding quickly and decisively when bias-related incidents occur.

When racial incidents do occur—as they will even in the most sensitive and committed campuses—it is the president who is in the best position to convert a negative experience into at least

into a learning experience and, with luck, even into a positive one. The president must convey a wider vision, going beyond the specifics of a precipitating incident on which honest but emotionally charged perceptions may differ widely, extending to the subtle, deep-seated beliefs and grievances that color all perceptions. The president must deal with the majority population, who may see only the "incident" and view it as isolated or trivial, and may deeply resent allegations of insensitivity and racism aimed at themselves. In short, a bias-related incident demands campus leadership that is at once committed, involved, and decisive, and at the same time is patient and wise and cool-headed.

At the system level, the 64-campus State University of New York (SUNY) has placed a priority on the recruitment and retention of underrepresented students and has expanded the campus educational programs to improve campus climate, maximize cultural diversity and pluralism, and minimize bias-related behavior. Like most campuses and systems, we have had our successes and failures, but we see steady long-term progress. Incidents of racial bigotry, homophobic behavior, sexism and anti-Semitism have occurred on a number of our campuses, but each incident has reminded us to continue with greater resolve, and most have left us a bit wiser if somewhat sadder.

The SUNY system has embraced a strategic action plan for the attainment of recruitment, retention and environmental enhancement goals by African, Asian, Hispanic and Native American students, faculty and administrators. A primary goal incorporated into the plan is the improvement of the campus climate. Some system-wide activities and programs in support of this goal include:

- *Recognizing our problems and publicly reaffirming our goals.* A third annual SUNY-wide conference will be entitled "Addressing the Needs of African, Asian, Hispanic and Native American Students: Improving the Quality of the Educational Climate." The two-day conference, planned for February 1990, will identify the factors that give rise to bias-related behavior; examine and discuss programs, on SUNY campuses and elsewhere, that have been effective in preventing bias-related behavior; examine the impact of bias-related aggression on retention, academic

performance and the extent to which students, faculty and staff permit themselves to interface with persons other than members of their own group; and explore ways to plan for an educational experience that introduces all students to a thoroughly diverse faculty and student body and a pluralistic curriculum.

- *Engaging of faculty and student leadership at the system level.* In order to involve SUNY's sixty-four campuses in a system-wide dialogue, a SUNY-wide teleconference on "The University's Responsibility Toward the Creation of a Bias-Free Educational Community" is planned for Fall 1990. Participating with the chancellor will be the president of the university senate and president of the student assembly. Following the teleconference each campus president will be encouraged to continue the dialogue with students, faculty and others in the college community.

- *Reminding campuses of the need to buttress rhetoric and goals with solid programs and evidence of success.* Each campus is required at least annually to describe its programs and activities designed to prevent the occurrence of bias-related behavior and to provide examples of the various ways campuses have organized to respond to biased aggression.

- *Getting attention.* The senior students of the Division of Theatre and Arts at the State University College at Purchase have produced a powerful play entitled *Under the Skin.* It is an intense, graphic representation of students' concepts of the silliness of stereotypes that grow out of mere grains of truths into the false and grotesque figures of illusion that often fuel racism, anti-Semitism, sexism, homophobia, and other forms of discrimination. This play is being made available for viewing at other SUNY campuses through support from SUNY Central Administration, State University College at Purchase, and the Martin Luther King Institute for Nonviolence.

- *Serving campuses.* The University office of Access and Retention Services for Underrepresented Students is preparing a bibliog-

raphy on bias-related behavior, especially on college campuses. In addition to activities, books, videos, etc., the bibliography will contain a list of college campus reports that have been prepared following the occurrences of bias-related activities on campuses throughout the United States.

- *Research into the phenomena of bias-related behavior.* A SUNY-wide survey is being conducted to assist an understanding of the prevalence of bias attitudes among SUNY students, and the number and nature of bias-related offenses at SUNY.

- *Assisting campuses in preparing for and dealing with bias-related incidents.* The maintenance of trust and open communication is extremely important in such cases. Often an outside presence can bridge communication gaps and provide perspectives that campus officers and student leaders cannot. Among the several alternatives available soon will be a Chancellor's SUNY-wide Intersocial/Multi-Ethnic Task Force. This group will consist of representatives from several campuses. Their primary role will be to assist campus presidents and Central Administration to plan SUNY-wide programs and activities to create a wholesome academic and social climate; to diffuse bias incidents on campus; and to monitor university-wide student efforts. A corresponding organization will exist at each campus.

- *Accelerate the hiring of underrepresented faculty and staff.* Cognizant of the fact that a healthy racial environment is related to the diversity of its faculty, the State University of New York has for the past three years sponsored a successful Graduate Fellowship Program for Underrepresented Students. Designed to increase the number of underrepresented students and enlarge the pool from which college faculty come, this program currently enrolls more than 500 graduate students who are African American, Hispanic American, and Native American. A newer, but equally successful, program is the university's Under-represented Faculty Initiative. This program loans faculty lines to SUNY campuses to encourage the appointment of African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans to tenure-track positions. Candidates are selected by departments,

are fully appointable and fill positions or a line in their precise areas of academic expertise, that would not otherwise be available.

Underrepresented students are more likely than any others to feel alienated in the typical college setting if for no other reason than they are seriously outnumbered. Particularly in this situation, small acts of friendship, warmth, and especially respect can mean a lot. Encouraging members of the teaching faculty merely to say "hello" to students may seem a trivial gesture, but it is not, and, importantly, first efforts can lead to the development of significant improvements in campus relationships.

We have learned that the occurrence of a racially motivated incident is not necessarily evidence of a lack of commitment on the part of the college to goals such as access, retention and the creation of a diverse educational setting. In fact, the contrary is often true: it may be the very campus that has successfully recruited significant numbers of underrepresented students that experiences racial stress. The reality is that there is heightened sensitivity and assertiveness in numbers.

We have learned that the catalyst for racial stress can frequently be traced to an extremely simple, sometimes inadvertent, exchange between two or more persons. The key to preventing such an incident from escalating into an event of disruptive and even destructive proportions is to communicate instantly and forthrightly and to define as quickly as possible the scope of issues that properly belong on the table at that time. Sometimes, the resources of a full system may complement those available to the single campus.

An institution of higher education, unlike any other, is home for diverse populations. Our failure thus far has been our inability to make maximum use of this diversity as a natural part of the educational process. If the re-emergence of visible incidents and aggressive response thereto has a positive side, it is to remind us of society's—and our—greatly unfinished agenda of social, economic, and racial justice and of the enormous potential of our colleges and universities in the creation of a truly just and pluralistic society.

# A Model: A University's Strategies and Actions from "Sit-In" to Resolution

Donald R. Gerth
President
California State University, Sacramento

*This is a case study of the emergence of problems in racial relationships on one university campus that provides a step-by-step account of responses, beginning with the first signals of tension, the development of explorative processes, and the achievement of acceptable resolution. The study is presented here in three parts as documented by the institution.*

- *Part 1—A memorandum by the dean of student affairs that outlines the course of developments.*
- *Part 2—A report to the president by members of an appointed Forum on Campus Racism.*
- *Part 3—A response by the president to the university community.*

## Part 1

Memorandum

To: Donald R. Gerth, President
From: George H. Wayne, Dean of Student Affairs
Subject: Forums on Racism at CSU, Sacramento
Date: January 10, 1990

On October 18, 1989, a group of students representing the Black Student Alliance (BSA) came to my office with some concerns about racism (differential treatment) on campus. The students threatened to demonstrate by not attending classes and performing "sit-ins" in front of the Student Services Center to protest the "racist behavior of faculty, staff and students." I encouraged them to avoid this initiative, inasmuch as there were a number of mechanisms already in place on campus designed to address issues of racism, sexism, etc. The students accepted my suggestion to present their concerns to the Affirmative Action Committee.

On October 19, 1989, the students met with the Affirmative Action Committee of the Academic Senate and presented their complaints orally. Subsequently, a written list of grievances was submitted to Presidential Assistant Betty Moulds and myself, the dean of students. The grievances, consisting of eight specific allegations, were then provided to the president's staff for review. Upon the recommendation of the president's staff, I consulted the affirmative action officer and the director of educational equity and developed a strategy to deal with the student concerns. That strategy recommended that open forums be held encouraging

students, faculty and staff to voice their concerns and/or raise issues regarding differential treatment on campus.

In the meantime, the local press had been contacted regarding the student allegations and were attempting to connect with me regarding the institution's response to the students' concerns. I encouraged the press to delay any publicity regarding this issue since the president was concerned about the allegations and was taking immediate steps to address the issue.

On October 31, 1989, the president issued a letter to the campus community establishing the "Forums on Racism." This letter pointed out that open forums would be held on the campus on Wednesday, November 8, 1989 from 1:30-3:30 p.m., Thursday, November 9, 1989 from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m., and Tuesday, November 14, 1989 from 5:15 to 7:15 p.m. These forums would be conducted in the Redwood Room of the University Union and encouraged all students, staff and faculty to attend and participate.

During the three sessions, there was "standing room only" with the first session, probably due to the presence of the media, experiencing the greatest turnout. Overall, approximately 900 people attended the three sessions. While the majority in attendance were students of color, a number of white students, faculty, staff and community members were also in attendance. Overall, the students were well-behaved and generally followed the instructions provided prior to their testimony. During the three sessions, fifty-two individual (some appeared more than once) testimonies were heard. Twenty-five on day one, ten on day two, and seventeen on day three. Again, while most of the experiences of alleged differential treatment were provided by students of color, comments were also heard from alumni, community representatives, and international students.

In compliance with the directions initially provided by the president, the forum members, including the dean of students, Chair of the Academic Affairs, Affirmative Action Officer, and the Presidential Educational Equity Committee Chair, submitted a report to the president. The report summarized the activities of the open forums. The final report was submitted to the president on November 28, 1989. The president subsequently accepted all

thirty-five recommendations of the committee and initiated immediate action to develop strategies for implementation and follow-up.

**Part 2**

Memorandum

To: Donald R. Gerth, President

From: Forum Members on Campus Racism
George H. Wayne, Dean of Student Affairs, Chair
Juanita Barrena, Chair, Academic Senate
David Leon, Assistant Vice President
for Academic Affairs
Stephanie Lieberman, Affirmative Action Director
John Maxwell, Chair, Campus Educational
Equity Committee

Subject: Summary of Forum Activities

Date: November 28, 1989

In compliance with your directions of October 31, 1989, the referenced individuals held open forums for students, staff, and faculty to further explore racism on campus. The following summary is submitted and divided into four categories: Overview, Categorization of Issues and Concerns, Student Organizations' Recommendations, and Forum Members' Recommendations. The letter of support from the Black Staff/Faculty Association is attached.

**Overview**

The hearings were conducted for three days in the Redwood Room of the University Union. Varying time slots were arranged to ensure all students had an opportunity to attend at least one session.

- Wednesday, November 8—1:30-3:30 p.m. (two hours)
- Thursday, November 9—4:00-5:00 p.m. (one hour)
- Tuesday, November 14—5:15-7:15 p.m. (two hours)

There was standing room only during each session, with the first session, probably due to the presence of the media, experiencing the greatest turnout. Overall, approximately 900 people attended the three sessions. While the majority in attendance

were students of color, a number of white students, faculty, staff and community members were also in attendance. Considering the volatile subject matter being presented, the students were well-behaved and generally followed the instructions provided prior to their testimony.

During the three sessions fifty-two individual (some appeared more than once) testimonies were heard: Twenty five on day one, ten on day two and seventeen on day three. Again, while most of the experiences of alleged differential treatment were provided by students of color, comments were also heard from alumni, community representatives, and international students.

**Categorization of Issues and Concerns**

In the forum panel's judgment, the testimony provided during the hearings revealed evidence that circumstances exist on the campus that serve to create an unsupportive and inhospitable educational environment for students of color. While much of the testimony provided examples of faculty behavior that students perceived as racist behavior, the committee, after further analysis of the data, concluded that the comments of students should not stand alone, but should be viewed as indicative of institutional practices/policies that create an environment that may result in instances of differential treatment of students of color. The following categories, not necessarily in order of priority, represent our interpretation of the student concerns within the broader context of institutional practices and policies:

1. Faculty/Staff Behavior Toward Students of Color:
   - Prejudgment of academic potential based on color, gender, or ethnicity.
   - Benign neglect.
   - Aversion and avoidance.
   - Lack of courtesy and respect.
   - Focusing attention on a student on the basis of gender or race/ethnicity.
   - Singling out students of color to provide an example.
   - Cultural insensitivity (i.e., use of language that is considered derogatory).

- Harassment and overt racist behavior.

2. Communications:
   - Lack of information regarding opportunities available to students (i.e., financial aid, pre-doctoral programs, student academic development, scholarships, etc.).
   - Lack of information to students regarding institutional changes (curriculum changes, advising, new program initiatives).
   - Inability to communicate with the system (provide input, interface, participate).
   - Lack of understanding of the university's organizational structure, the functions involved, and how to participate.

3. Curriculum Issues:
   - Lack of an ethnic studies requirement.
   - Failure to include the contributions and perspectives of women and minorities across the curriculum.
   - Use of culturally biased texts, materials, and examples in courses.
   - Institutional use of culturally biased assessment methods (ACT, Placement Exams, etc.).
   - Inadequate maintenance and development of cultural content courses that reflect racial and ethnic diversity.

4. Faculty/Staff Diversity:
   - Lack of faculty and staff representing racial and ethnic diversity.

5. Campus Culture/Environment:
   - Lack of space for meeting and congregating.
   - Absence of a Multi-Cultural Center.
   - Lack of support for cultural events that reflect racial/ethnic minorities.
   - Concern for self-segregation on the basis of race/ethnicity.
   - Lack of a multi-ethnic cultural theme throughout the university environment. (e.g., music, art exhibits, speakers, activities, etc.).

6. Academic and Student Service Support System:
   - Inadequate financial aid resources.
   - Inadequate funding of student support programs (CAMP, etc.).
   - Inadequate resources devoted to programs to recruit and retain underrepresented students.
   - Institutional insensitivity to the historic symbolic significance of the names of student support programs that have served underrepresented ethnic minorities (i.g., EOP, SAA).
   - Perceptions that traditional programs designed to serve underrepresented students have been regulated to lower levels in the organizational hierarchy resulting in their importance and effectiveness being diminished.

7. Process Issues:
   - Lack of clear and consistent departmental and university policies and procedures to address student complaints regarding differential treatment.
   - Lack of trust that the processes that do exist will provide redress.
   - Reluctance to raise the issue or file a complaint related to differential treatment for fear of retaliation.
   - Lack of understanding of the contractual/legal constraints in the conduct and outcome of the process.
   - Frustration and anger with the complexity, duration, and lack of feedback inherent in the existing process.

8. Personal Issues:
   Alienation from the university community caused by:
   - Racist graffiti and other published racist material.
   - Isolation in classes caused by the absence of other students of color.
   - Lack of minority faculty and staff to serve as role models and advisers.
   - Blatant acts of racism by members of the campus community in social environments.
   - Covert and overt acts of racism by students in the classroom.

**Student Organizations' Recommendations**

1. Expand the programs that recruit and retain underrepresented ethnic students like EOP, SAA, Science Educational Equity, Minority Engineering Program, and provide hard monies for programs like CAMP that are now funded by soft monies.

2. Support the expansion of financial grants for undergraduate and graduate underrepresented ethnic groups that have financial need.

3. Establish a university environment that facilitates the recruitment, retention and graduation of all ethnic students that are underrepresented.

4. Identify and hire minority faculty, staff, managers and policy makers, that represent the diversity of our university.

5. Make ethnic studies a requirement, a part of the general education pattern.

6. Establish a multicultural student body.

7. Establish a board that would work with the president as a resource and serve to increase the accountability for Affirmative Action inefficiencies (deficiencies?).

8. The president or the multicultural committee develop a budget and attach monies to the Multicultural Center proposal to:
   a. hire an administrator, staff, students and counselors. New and more counselors need to be added, not just expand the jobs and responsibilities of the counselors who work on campus now,
   b. fund the research projects stated in the proposal,
   c. fund academic and professional travel and other general operation services stated in the proposal.

9. Multicultural Center should be open by Spring 1990, with office space for clubs and organizations.

10. President should announce and publish (press conference) a plan on how to deal with campus racism and recruitment and retention of student of color.

11. (AASA, Mecha, NAYA, ASU) Each faculty, staff, and administrator should be required to take sensitivity workshops about people of color. These workshops should be taught not only by professionals but also representatives of the different cultural groups. There should be stiff penalties for absenteeism.

12. Students of color should be appointed to every auxiliary committee where students are concerned. Administration should be committed to making sure that committee positions are advertised so that all people know about the positions.

13. A deadline of 4/16/90 5:00 p.m. by which time there should be some physical evidence of efforts made by the administration to solve these problems.

**Forum Members' Recommendations**

Based on our analysis of the testimony provided at the forums and our review of policies and practices that pertain to the issues raised, the panel has formulated a series of recommendations. The panel also reviewed the ten recommendations of student organizations in terms of their relevance in addressing the issues and concerns identified. The student organizations' recommendations were addressed and are so noted in our recommendations. It should also be noted that some of the student organizations' recommendations have been and are currently being addressed by the university.

1. Faculty/Staff Behavior Toward Students

(This recommendation responds to student organizations' recommendation #8.) In the committee's judgment, the primary issue was faculty/staff behavior and insensitivity to students generally and students of color specifically. The committee recommends initiation of campus-based programs to explore awareness of cultural differences, self-assessment of possible biases and prejudices, and the facilitation of desired behavioral changes.

Such initiatives should be designed to assist students, faculty, staff, and administrators to develop greater tolerance, understanding, and sensitivity in relating with students of color. Workshops and seminars should be provided to faculty to develop non-discriminatory teaching techniques, teaching practices that are sensitive to different learning styles, and other non-differential treatment issues. Funds should be allocated to ensure nationally recognized professionals in the area of cultural sensitivity provide the programming. To implement these general recommendations, we propose the following activities:

a. Support the development of an API Grant proposal, for funding in 1990, under the category of "Curriculum and Faculty Development for a Multi-Cultural Institution" to increase awareness and sensitivity to students of color.

b. Conduct a mandatory workshop, in Spring 1990, for department chairs that addresses responsibilities spelled out in PM 89-14, "Roles and Responsibilities of the Department Chair," specifically dealing with student grievances, faculty recruitment as it relates to diversity, and academic advising with an emphasis on students of color.

c. We recommend to the president that the Academic Senate consider amending PM 89-14 to include the responsibility for implementing university educational equity programs, within the department, fostering the development of departmental educational equity programs, and coordinating department programs with school and university programs to the roles and responsibilities of department chairs.

d. Repeat in Fall 1990 the faculty mentor workshop previously conducted in Fall 1987 to increase faculty sensitivity.

e. Revive and expand the University Faculty Mentor Program.

f. Implement fully the new Academic Advising Policy that will increase faculty contact with students and provide appropriate training of faculty to improve student/faculty communication.

g. The Academic Senate pay particular attention to the report of the System-Wide Task Force titled Faculty Involvement in Student Retention and Advising (draft currently under review by the Academic Policies Committee) and develop, as necessary,

policies in the report pertaining to faculty involvement in these activities.

2. Communications

The very fact that most of the students who provided testimony were not familiar with many of the programs, policies, and/or procedures that are designed to provide support (equity initiatives, etc.), revealed that the institution may have failed to communicate with them efficiently and effectively. In the panel's judgment, ASI, as currently constituted, does not serve as an effective vehicle for students of color to participate in university governance. Although Academic Senate and university committees provide for student representation, reliance on ASI to make appointments of students of color has not yielded appropriate students of color participation in university governance. The panel recommends that the president:

a. Issue a progress report on changes that have occurred to date (i.e., faculty hiring, opportunity programs, changes in curriculum, program changes, etc.).

b. Establish an ongoing direct channel of communication with students (e.g., newsletter, student handbook).

c. Initiate a review of our orientation program to ensure students of color are familiarized with the culture of the university and are provided strategies for adjustment and adaptation.

d. Initiate consultation on the development of an orientation course similar to the Freshman Year Experience for all new students.

e. Explore, with the Academic Senate, the possibility of revising the process of appointing students to committees, to insure that students of color are represented in university governance. (This recommendation responds to student organizations' recommendation #9.)

f. Establish a university repository and resources center where students of color can obtain information on programs that are available to them (e.g., grants, fellowships, scholarships, and internships).

g. Establish, for the remainder of this academic year, an ad hoc committee, consisting of students of color, to serve as a

vehicle of communications on the progress of issues addressed in this report. (This recommendation responds to student organizations' recommendations #7 & 9.)

3. Curriculum Issues:

(This recommendation responds to student organizations' recommendation #5). It was evident that the students have concerns regarding the curriculum. However, many of these issues are being addressed currently. For example, the Academic Senate is considering a proposal to implement, in 1990, a three-unit GE course requirement on race and ethnicity in American society. The Academic Senate is also recommending revision of the GE program to ensure that students completing the curriculum in the arts, humanities and social sciences shall be exposed to a development and appreciation of and for the contributions and perspectives of women and minorities. Contingent upon Academic Senate approval of the above proposals, the panel recommends that the president:

a. Accept and provide appropriate resource support to implement the revised requirement.

b. Encourage and support with funds faculty efforts to revise curricula. A portion of the lottery funds for faculty development should be set aside for this.

c. Support the development of a campus proposal for funding under the "Academic Improvement" grant category "Curriculum and Faculty Development for a Multi-Cultural University" that provides funding for curricula revision.

4. Faculty/Staff Diversity

(This recommendation responds to student organizations' recommendation #4.) It is evident that the students have concerns regarding increasing the diversity of faculty and staff. Academic departments' appointment committees and administrative search committees should be committed to the spirit of equity and diversity rather than to a technically perfect search as evidenced by the results of their efforts. This issue is currently being addressed. Specifically, we recommend:

a. The president implement immediately the Hiring Oppor-

tunity Group's program for diversity hiring which was endorsed by the Academic Senate. This program provides for at least seven opportunity hires and additional funds for diversity recruitment.

b. The Academic Senate review and endorse the Hiring Improvement Program currently before the Affirmative Action Committee. This program redefines the process of faculty recruitment and will facilitate the appointment of faculty of color.

c. The university develop a coordinated program that will increase the number of students of color who continue in their studies to become future faculty members (e.g., cooperative doctoral programs, pre-doctoral). Specifically, departments who do not have diversity among their student majors should develop programs for increasing their diversity with a focus on encouraging students of color to continue in their studies to become future faculty members. If possible, the program should provide for a waiver of the affirmative action recruitment process for those persons sponsored by the department for the Doctoral Incentive Forgivable Loan Program. The panel also recommends that the president urge the chancellor to decentralize the predoctoral and Doctoral Incentive Forgivable Loan programs to address the specific needs of our campus.

d. The administration continue to monitor the results of the application of the affirmative hiring policy and continue to terminate searches where necessary to insure that goals are met.

e. Funding be provided for the development and distribution of quality recruitment materials especially designed to recruit faculty of color.

5. Campus Culture/Environment

(This recommendation responds to student organizations' recommendation #8.) It was evident from the forums that students expressed feelings of alienation from the rest of the campus community. The panel recommends:

a. That, if possible, the "Multi-Cultural Center" become operational before the end of the 1989-90 academic year. Last summer President Gerth created a task force, composed of faculty, staff and the ASI president, to develop a proposal for creating a center on campus. The task force held an open meeting with students on Monday, November 20, to give them an oppor-

tunity to provide input. The proposal is now being reviewed by a student panel who will work closely with the task force to recommend changes. The proposal will be submitted to President Gerth by the end of Fall 1989. The panel recommends that the president expedite consultation with the Academic Senate, Associated Students (ASI), University Staff Assembly (USA), and other campus bodies, as appropriate, in order that the center can become operational before the end of the 1989-90 academic year.

b. That the president encourage the Union, the Hornet Foundation, and other auxiliary organizations to foster a multicultural environment by serving a wide variety of ethnic foods, hosting more ethnic music performance, promoting ethnic art exhibits, sponsoring more speakers who address ethnic issues, and including more ethnic programming in the local public radio station.

6. Academic and Student Support Systems

(This recommendation responds to student organizations' recommendations 1,2,3, and 6.) Although a number of university initiatives to recruit and retain underrepresented students have been undertaken, it was clear that: (1) many students of color were unaware of these programs, and (2) there is need to expand existing programs and develop new programs to achieve the educational equity goals set by the university. Hence, the panel recommends the following:

a. That copies of the new program planning guide titled "Academic Support Programs: Educational Equity," be distributed to students as soon as possible.

b. That a brochure be developed for distribution to students that identifies financial grant/academic development opportunities available to them (e.g., MAD, SAD, pre-doctoral loan programs, institutional scholarships, minority graduate fellowships, Hispanic scholarship fund, community college and public school internship programs, etc.).

c. That resources allocated to discipline-based educational equity programs be increased as necessary to maintain and expand the services provided. (The panel notes that funds available for these programs have remained at the same level since 1986).

d. That a commitment be made to institutionalize pilot programs, similar to ASAP and programs funded by outside grants (e.g. CAMP) that have proven to be effective in the recruitment and retention of underrepresented students.

e. That the traditional services provided by EOP and SAA be maintained as identified functional elements within USESS and not diminished by the expansion of responsibility without the development of corresponding resource support for new programs.

f. That funding be provided for the development and distribution of quality recruitment materials especially designed to recruit students of color.

g. That student service professionals whose primary responsibility is to provide support services to students of color be provided the opportunity for further professional development and involvement in the development and implementation of programs that serve students of color.

7. Process Issues

It was apparent to the panel, from the testimony of the students, that clear and consistent departmental and university policies had not been formulated and/or communicated effectively to all members of the campus community. The initiatives recommended in the area of communication will mitigate this deficiency in the long run; however, the following actions are necessary in order to address the immediate concerns of the students:

a. Implement fully the policy that requires each department/school to have policies and procedures for dealing with student complaints and grievances.

b. Direct the affirmative action officer and dean of students to follow up, as appropriate on specific complaints raised by students in their testimony or submitted on forms provided at the forums.

8. Personal Issues

The committee viewed these issues as symptomatic of other institutional and individual shortcomings in supporting the institution's commitment to diversity. We recognize that a sense

of worth is fundamental to good academic performance. If students of color constantly receive messages that impugn their competence, cultural values, intrinsic worth, and even their right of access, their success is doubtful. We feel that if the institution takes action to initiate the programs/policies recommended, such initiatives will set standards of expected behavior for the entire campus community and increase opportunities for interracial interaction, thereby creating a secure and safe campus environment that discourages harassment or any other hostile behavior directed toward persons of color.

The evidence today suggests that American colleges and universities are experiencing a resurgence of racial and ethnic intolerance—most notably bias-related violence. Since this committee is not representative of the entire campus nor are its members qualified to address all of the issues related to such a complex phenomenon as differential treatment, we recommend a presidentially impaneled group be designated to monitor the campus racial climate and its progress in meeting its commitment to diversity.

## California State University, Sacramento Black Staff and Faculty Association

The Black Staff and Faculty Association is fully in support of the students in their allegations of racism. Further the racist acts and attitudes are not restricted to the classroom. The acts are also committed by staff and faculty hiring committees, despite affirmative action and equal opportunity employment. We need only look around us to confirm the fact that minority staff and faculty have the lowest representation on campus in all levels of the university. This is not to imply that we should be in the majority; however, the employment composition of the university should adequately reflect the population that it serves.

Therefore, the Black Staff and Faculty Association views it as imperative that the university aggressively recruit and hire African-American faculty and staff and establish an open-door policy to the administration to immediately address the concerns of students, staff and faculty. Further, it is necessary that the

administration deal swiftly and effectively to resolve those situations involving racism and racist activities.

*Gilbert Hamilton, Chair*
*Black Staff and Faculty Association*

**Part 3**

Memorandum
To: University Community, Students, Faculty, Staff
From: Donald R. Gerth, President
Re: Panel Report on Forums on Racism Issues
Date: December 8, 1989

The subject of racism in the life of the university has been a compelling topic of dialogue and thoughtful consideration over the past six weeks. We must now move beyond this phase. I have promised the campus a prompt response to the Report of the Panel. Because of the lateness in the semester, I am responding in writing.

We have been confronting an issue which is embedded in historic American culture and is rightly a matter of concern to most universities in this nation, and especially in this state. We face a large challenge because racial and ethnic factors play a part in virtually every culture and nation around the world.

Realistically, we must recognize that higher education is influenced by the values and attitudes in our society—by those that are ennobling and humane and by those that are destructive and hateful. But universities have a special and distinct role in our culture—and must stand apart from many popular trends. Fundamental agreement and settled consensus exist on this campus, in this academic community, that racism, or other destructive distinctions among people, have no place here. Above all, the center of our commitment must be to reason, knowledge, human improvement, and to the dignity of the individual. Its poisonous assault on these central values is what makes racism so deadly to our lives on a university campus.

Then what is the issue? It is that we must achieve a clearer understanding and a greater capacity to create an environment free of racism. The issue is not whether we can implement

changes to end lingering racism, but how we can create a shared culture that rejects racism of any kind. We need a shared culture which confirms or places a high value on the rich diversity of all of the people in this institution and around the world.

The report of the panel members of the Forum on Racism, the result of three open forums and the deliberation of the panel, is before us. I want to thank the members of the panel for their intense commitment to the task. They have produced 35 recommendations which are both encompassing and practical.

In its report, the panel sought to identify, from the testimony presented at the forums, the behaviors, policies, and practices that have created an inhospitable environment for many students of color. Having described these elements, the report follows with recommendations that deal directly with the concerns raised.

I heartily endorse all thirty-five recommendations of the panel. For ease of consideration, I am dividing the recommendations into three categories: (1) those which I am now approving and am personally implementing; (2) those which I am now approving and am delegating responsibility for implementation; and (3) those which require consultation with campus bodies, which I am now initiating.

I would like to announce to the campus at this time two actions I am taking in conjunction with the first category noted above, the recommendations which I am personally implementing. First, with Dean Wayne, I am establishing for the remainder of this year an ad hoc group, consisting of students of color, to serve as a vehicle of communications on the progress of issues addressed in this report (Forum Panel recommendation #2g). Second, the Forum panel recommended "a presidentially empaneled group be designated to monitor the campus racial climate its progress in meeting its commitment to diversity" (recommendation #8). I am establishing a University Commission on Human Relations, to be advisory to me. I will closely monitor and integrate the follow-up activities. Reports on follow-up initiatives will be prepared on a monthly basis and published throughout the remainder of the academic year.

It is useful to comment here on three key recommendations which directly address issues raised by students and student organizations and presented in a formal statement at the end of

the third open forum, recommendations which I am now approving and delegating responsibility for implementation. Specifically, these relate to increased faculty diversity, instituting an ethnic studies requirement, and the establishment of a multicultural center. (1) As recommended by the panel, I am approving the Academic Senate recommendation (Forum Panel recommendation #4a) to establish a program for faculty diversity hiring, the establishment of a pool of positions for specific faculty appointments, and the allocation of funds for diversity recruitment. (2) As recommended by the panel, I am approving the Academic Senate recommendation (Forum Panel recommendation #3a) to implement in Fall 1990 a general education course requirement on race and ethnicity in American society. Appropriate resources will be allocated to make this possible. (3) As recommended by the panel, I am reviewing the report of the Multi-cultural Center Task Force of December 6 (Panel recommendation #5a) with appropriate members of the university community to determine, from the input from students and task force, the details for establishing a center that will enhance our efforts to understand and appreciate diversity.

Although it will be an ongoing effort to realize fully the goals articulated by the Multi-cultural Center Task Force, several of the programs recommended will be initiated in Spring 1990, including the identification of a place to house the center and the appointment of an interim director and Center advisory committee. These are immediate and tangible steps toward the campus culture we seek.

The three actions noted above are a result of established processes of governance within the university. One recommendation finds its immediate origin in an Academic Senate committee initiative of about two years ago, another in a Council of Deans discussion in Spring 1989, and a third in the 1988-89 campuswide discussion on "a celebration of diversity." The people of this university are committed to this long-range approach, and I am proud of you for that.

The Forums on Racism have served as a catalyst, but they must not be the final word. Our students expressed real and genuine grievances to which we are responding. All of us at the university (including me) will benefit from more focused efforts to

recognize how diversity improves our education and from the positive results which flow from that understanding.

We are moving in the right direction.

# Strategies to Accommodate Change

John D. Welty
President
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

As colleges and universities succeed in attracting more students who come from ethnic minorities, we must expect an increase in incidents of ethnoviolence and conflict on campus. Unfortunately, however, as the college population of minorities increases, some officials in higher education conclude that they have met their commitments and neglect to take a firm and positive address to the complexities of greatly diversified enrollments. Such conclusions not only miss the mark; they may expose institutions to crises that may well be avoided by attention to the ever present tensions that accompany ethnic mix.

Among the basic requirements for this effective response is the appointment of an identifiable crisis management team that can be called to prompt action. Depending on the size and complexity of a campus, this team should include delegated representatives from all the major divisions of the university and of the offices of the vice president and president. On smaller campuses, these teams may include presidents and vice presidents. On larger campuses, they may include a combination of senior staff officials and/or their assistants. The key is to ensure representation from each division and to delegate authority to these individuals to act and to provide direct access to the president if he or she is not involved in the group.

In addition, it is vital that senior administrators—and in particular the president, or the representative who is seen as his/her designee—have ongoing contact with the minority student community. This requires periodic contact and discussion with individuals in the community and depends upon the president's success in convincing students of his/her concern for their well being. It is also very important for the president to have access to minority faculty members on a continuing basis.

It is extremely important to develop a policy to anticipate ethnic discrimination and to establish procedures to deal with allegations and accusations of discrimination or ethnic violence. It is critical that incidents of ethnoviolence or intimidation be reported promptly and that the president's office or the designated leader of the crisis team be advised as soon as an incident occurs. Frequently, the action that is taken within the first few hours after an incident will determine the ultimate effectiveness of the response.

When an incident is reported, the crisis management team must determine who will be responsible for specific investigative, reportive, or enforcement assignments and what police action, if any, is appropriate. Other steps that must be taken, in addition to the prompt investigation and solicitous attention to the victim(s), include a continuing communication with the leadership of the minority community on campus and a decision about the release of information to the media by a designated spokesperson, who may also be a permanent member of the crisis team.

Once a determination has been made about the seriousness of an incident, the process to be applied must be announced quickly and forcefully to forestall wrangling argument about the attributes of a response; debate over procedure can distort an incident and delay its resolution. Whatever process is identified as appropriate must be communicated promptly, clearly and in its entirety to the leadership of the minority community. A prevailing difficulty that must be explained is that demands for prompt action must often be countered with the obligations of due process.

While the president must be kept fully informed, presidential authority should be used cautiously and quietly. When the minority community demands immediate action following a serious incident of violence, it may become necessary for him or her to remind the institution that planned policies and processes are in place and to communicate the design of intended action clearly. Once an announced process has been established, it must be maintained while the president remains visible and accessible to concerned students, reserving authority for the appropriate time to make a statement to conclude responsive action and announce whatever resolution has been made.

It is important to keep executive responsibility on campus, but in the event of a major altercation university trustees and key state officials must be fully informed. Individuals external to the campus but vitally interested in its operations will have a proprietary concern, and keeping them advised will suggest effectiveness and control. Community agencies that insist on being heard during a campus crisis must be accommodated without encouraging intervention.

To summarize, these comments derive from the following basic assumptions:

- Multi-racial enrollments generate unavoidable situations that can stimulate conflict, friction, and abrasion.

- Planning—with comprehensive policies and processes developed by the administration, faculty, and students and including a permanently assigned crisis management team—can provide the means for rapid containment of eruption and serve the victims of violence and harassment.

- Prompt acknowledgment of conflict, with firmly announced processes for resolution, derived from established rules and policies, can defuse student explosiveness and relieve anxiety on and off campus.

- Attention to preventive planning can reduce the prospects of violence and harassment and contribute to maintaining parity and harmony on campus.

❦

*In the following comments Sharon Brown-McGowan, Assistant Provost, describes a successful design for faculty recruitment and Alphonse Novels, Director for Minority Affairs, outlines strategies that can contribute to reducing confrontation in multi-ethnic populations.*

Recruitment of faculty members of diverse cultural heritage has become a major priority at IUP in helping to create a campus culture which soothes racial and ethnic tensions. Aggressive recruitment of faculty—i.e., increased personal contacts, marketing and recruitment activities, and increased involvement of minority faculty in the search process—are the strategies being employed to accomplish a pluralistic and diverse campus culture.

Particular emphasis is being placed on networking, personal contacts and "directing" or "targeting" faculty positions as minority-only. Minority is defined as: Black, Hispanic, Asian and Pacific

Islander and Native American. In addition to these aforementioned categories, women are also targeted as an equity group for intensified recruitment efforts.

With respect to design strategies to increase the diversity of faculty on campus, a five-year affirmative action plan has been developed that includes input from all of the major constituencies on campus. Hiring goals for all major personnel categories, including faculty, have been established for Black, Hispanic and women equity groups. These goals were established using an eight-factor analysis formula that calculates the disparity between the availability of a particular group and the actual composition of the current work force by employee category. Additionally, using national availability statistics by discipline, departments that are to conduct "directed" or "targeted" searches are identified.

The affirmative action officer works very closely with all search committees from the very onset of the search process and assists in the preparation/approval process of designing affirmative action plans and advertisements. Before candidates are invited to campus for interviews, a rigorous review of all candidate files for each search takes place in order to ensure that all ethnic and social equity groups whose members have applied for any given position have been appropriately included or excluded. This review takes place at three levels: the college dean, the affirmative action officer, and the provost and vice president for academic affairs.

The review at the affirmative action officer level encompasses the construction of a grid which includes the required and preferred qualifications as outlined in the advertisement and a review of each candidate's application (those recommended for interview as well as all identified individuals in the ethnic or social equity groups). Only searches that include qualified individuals are approved to proceed with the selection process. Closely monitoring the search process, however, is only one of several strategies to assist in increasing cultural diversity.

Minority members who are currently on the faculty participate in active recruiting, vis-a-vis setting up linkages through conference attendance and personal contacts. Additionally, all minority faculty members on campus are sent position an-

nouncements for all vacancies and are asked to contact the affirmative action officer with the names of colleagues whom they would recommend for a particular position. The affirmative action officer, in turn, personally contacts those referrals and encourages application for positions.

Arrangements are made by the affirmative action officer for time to be spent during the interview process with current IUP faculty of the same ethnicity and/or gender. This time spent with similarly situated individuals begins to build a bond or network which is a crucial element with respect to retention.

More emphasis is currently being placed on retention than has been practiced in the past. With increased competition for relatively small numbers of minority faculty, it has become important to retain those faculty members who were so diligently and successfully recruited. Some activities designed to enhance retention are conducting workshops on the issues of tenure and promotion, and sponsoring cultural activities, speeches and social activities and receptions to welcome and recognize our culturally diverse faculty.

A growing sensitivity to the needs and issues of minority individuals is a key in recruiting and retaining these individuals as faculty on campus. Further, it has been deemed vitally essential by the IUP administration that a culturally diverse faculty will contribute to a culturally harmonious campus.

*Sharon Brown-McGowan*
*Assistant Provost*

A comprehensive campuswide plan must be in place to deal effectively with anti-minority attitudes and actions within a campus environment. While it is virtually impossible to eliminate all anti-minority attitudes, steps can be taken to deal effectively with these attitudes through development of a comprehensive plan.

The first and foremost advocate for such a plan should be the president, who, along with his or her staff of vice presidents, deans, chairs and other key personnel, must make certain that the plan is implemented and policies are enforced. In preparing a plan, no segment of the campus community should be ex-

cluded. It should be emphasized to students and others that they, too, have a significant role to play in the institution's goal of promoting excellence through racial and cultural diversity.

Principal among strategies to combat anti-minority attitudes and actions on campus is a clear and forceful statement from the president urging the campus community to join in celebrating cultural diversity and opposing racial intolerance.

Second, a "snapshot" of the institution should be taken to assess the participation level of minorities in all aspects of campus activity. These areas include: administration, staff, faculty—tenure track and nontenure track positions, students—graduate and undergraduate, campus organizations, campus governance, student leadership, residence life leadership and staff, intercollegiate athletics, financial aid.

Third, strategies to address multicultural issues should be developed for the campus, and major areas of the institution should be targeted. These might include:

**Campuswide**

- Establish an Office of Minority Affairs, responsible for review and assessment of campus climate.

- Develop a comprehensive affirmative action plan outlining strategies for recruitment and retention of minority faculty, staff and students.

- Develop a mechanism for filing, hearing, adjudicating and resolving complaints of racial discrimination.

- Conduct workshops for the total campus community on racial awareness, sensitivity toward others and cross-cultural communications. In particular, faculty leaders, student leaders, union membership, campus media people and other key opinion leaders should be targeted.

- Provide training for a cadre of campus personnel to serve as workshop facilitators on race relations. This cadre should include faculty, staff and students.

- Publicize the achievements and accomplishments of minorities through campus publications and press releases.

- Provide year-round multicultural enrichment programs.

- Promote and encourage participation in diverse cultural activities.

**Faculty**

- Make a commitment to provide a classroom climate that is responsive to the learning patterns of all students.

- Provide workshops for faculty to develop sensitivity toward minorities in the classroom.

- Provide training to develop skills in divergent learning/teaching styles.

- Provide workshops on developing techniques of including contributions made by minorities in the curriculum.

- Design faculty exchange programs and visiting professorships as a means of promoting divergent philosophical and cultural views.

- Develop orientation programs to inform and acquaint new faculty with multicultural issues.

- Expect that applications for tenure and promotion include evidence of improving the climate for racial and ethnic minorities.

**Administrators/Staff**

- Expect administration and staff to participate in racial awareness and sensitivity workshops.

- Provide training to enhance cross-cultural communication and management skills.

- Develop performance evaluation procedures that take into consideration the unique contributions made by minority employees.

- Develop equitable employment procedures to ensure the recruitment, retention and promotion of minority personnel.

**Students**

- Expand existing orientation programs to include sessions dealing with multicultural issues. Students should be made to understand the institution's policy on racism and the fact that acts of intolerance and discrimination are not tolerated.

- Race and intergroup relations workshops should be provided at regular intervals for student leaders, student resident assistants, student workers, clubs, organizations, Greeks and other groups. In particular, student groups that may hold anti-minority sentiments should be targeted.

- Promote and provide opportunities for divergent campus groups to engage in joint sponsorship of activities.

Since minorities out of necessity will venture outside the boundaries of the immediate campus environment into the community at large and will face the possibility of hostility, resentment and intolerance, it is important that business and civic leaders become aware and assist the institution in accomplishing its goals.

The primary aim, therefore, is to educate the community as to the benefits of a racially and ethnically diverse environment. The efforts must be institutionalized so that it is ongoing.

*Alphonse Novels*
*Director of Minority Affairs*

# Ethnically and Racially Diverse Faculty: A Response to Change

Dale F. Nitzschke
President
Marshall University (WV)

Betty J. Cleckley
Vice President for Multicultural Affairs
Marshall University

David Satcher
President
Meharry Medical College

*Marshall University was extremely pleased at having been asked to participate in the Forum. As is true at so many other institutions, Marshall University is aggressively pursuing initiatives that will result in a campus environment that is truly and comprehensively multicultural. In this article, Betty J. Cleckley, vice president for multicultural affairs, describes some recent administrative initiatives at Marshall University in Huntington, West Virginia, and David Satcher, president, Meharry Medical College, outlines a model for recruitment of minority faculty at Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tennessee.*

The past several years witnessed a rise in racial incidents and violence on campuses across the country, described by some observers as evidence of a "new racism." Public outcry and increasing student protests against racism in institutions of higher education were reflected in debates, discussions, and confrontations on college campuses. At institutions ranging from Marshall University and the Universities of Tennessee and South Carolina to such prestigious institutions as Smith College, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, students challenged administrators to eradicate racism and secure a more equitable representation of diverse groups and cultures.

While colleges and universities responded to students' demands and the need for change—with varying interest, capacities, resources, and conditions—the progress made was slow and incremental.

Although the problem of equitable representation of minorities (e.g., African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and Hispanics) in higher education is substantial and chronic, the current concern has been generated in part by the American Council on Education (ACE), under the able leadership of its president, Robert Atwell. The 1988 ACE report *One-Third of a Nation* noted that the United States as a nation must address the participation of underrepresented minorities in colleges and universities. This matter is critical because the number of ethnic/racial minorities is increasing in the population.[1] "By the year 2000, 85 percent of new entrants to the nation's work force will be members of minority groups and women."[2] This grave issue challenges us as educators not simply to provide potential

students with access to higher education but to ensure that they are educationally prepared to participate fully in the mainstream of society.

Our thesis is that an underrepresentation of ethnic/racial perspectives in higher education institutions is directly proportional to the degree of fundamental ethnic/racial homogeneity in the structure of that institution. From this it follows that a key to solving the problem of equitable representation of minorities is diversity: the more heterogeneous the institutional structure, the less one-sided the institutional perspective. Once the concept of diversity is implemented, ethnic/racial representation can be further developed as necessary.

We propose such diversification, with a particular focus on faculty recruitment, as an important way to obtain an increasing awareness of multicultural perspectives and eliminate racially based campus violence.

**Administrative Response at Marshall University**

Sharing his views on the rise of violence and underrepresentation of minorities in a communication to the Governor of West Virginia, Dale Nitzschke, president of Marshall University, observes:

> *It is apparent that this nation once again has become a cauldron of simmering racial tensions occasionally erupting into violence. The number of radical clashes on our campus is increasing. At the same time minority participation in higher education has decreased significantly, particularly black males, while the nation's minority population has increased dramatically.*[3]

Marshall's interest in eradicating racial violence and increasing minority participation is reflected in ongoing initiatives that existed prior to the racial incidents that flared up during the spring of 1989. Among these are a speaker series designed to increase minority presence on campus, an emphasis on the recruitment of minority faculty, staff and students, and training sessions designed to increase faculty, staff, and students' understanding of ethnic/racial groups.



105

The priority accorded to resolving campus unrest subsequent to the incidents is shown by President Nitzschke's creation of the Council on Cultural and Racial Diversity. Comprising a cross-section of university representatives, the council has as its primary purpose to review and make recommendations that will increase ethnic/racial diversity at the institution and to develop a comprehensive plan to make Marshall University a more multicultural, pluralistic community. The position of Vice President for Multicultural Affairs had been created and an experienced, highly qualified administrator appointed to provide leadership in strengthening multicultural developments by facilitating and coordinating the collective efforts of all campus constituents.

**Faculty Diversity as One Strategy**

The problems of racially based campus violence and underrepresentation of diverse groups are complex and must be countered on several fronts. Approaches include changing curriculum; developing innovative recruitment strategies for faculty, students, and staff; and otherwise increasing institutional diversity to reflect greater awareness of multicultural perspectives. Thus, the concept of diversity must influence curriculum, programs, search committees, admissions policies, and faculty recruitment.[4]

Because minority faculty serve not only their institutions but also the community, they are a major resource for universities. They may be particularly useful in addressing campus violence, with each minority faculty member contributing in accord with his or her ability, interest, or concern. The vital contributions of faculty members to higher education have led some observers to perceive minority faculty as a remedy for racial incidents. John Neely observes:

> *The utility of minority faculty is invaluable. They are essential ingredients in the entire framework of achieving both social and educational equality. . . . They provide a unique service to the college community through their informal (formal) roles as counselors, advisors, and successful role models. Their presence, per-*

*formance and interaction with whites facilitate attitude change in better race relationships. More importantly they contribute to the success rate of minority students and their presence is directly attributable to the overall [climate] and success of the institution in making racial parity a reality.*[5]

These contributions may best be realized by recruiting strong faculty who will be demonstratively committed to equity and will, as necessary, work to ameliorate racial tensions on campus.

Although institutions such as Marshall University are committed to recruiting minority faculty, they are deeply concerned with the well-documented shortage of faculty available, specifically African Americans, Native Americans, and Hispanics.[6] Furthermore, the pool of available minority faculty is small and concentrated in a few fields such as education and the social sciences. One consequence of this situation is that competition among universities for diverse faculty will be intense. Varied, innovative approaches will be essential.

In light of this shortage, the best means of attracting and recruiting diverse faculty for majority universities becomes a major concern for public and private higher education. This is especially true among institutions such as Marshall University, which has explicitly stated its responsibility, interest, and commitment to recruit and retain minorities in its undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools.

## A Model of Minority Faculty Recruitment at Meharry Medical College

For a successful model which illustrates how minority faculty may be recruited, we turn to a private historically black institution, Meharry Medical College, which is providing national leadership. The usefulness of the model lies perhaps in its ability to serve as an effective minority recruitment strategy.

There appear to be two factors that have contributed to Meharry's attracting more than forty full-time outstanding minority faculty to Meharry within a five year period, while they were frequently being offered positions at majority institutions with

strong financial resources. First, African American faculty were attracted to Meharry because of its mission, which includes improving access to higher education for African Americans and other minorities. Many well-qualified minority faculty perceive the institution as a unique opportunity to contribute something back to the communities from which they came. Some have spent years at outstanding majority institutions, but have felt disconnected from their roots or problems of minority communities.

The second factor in attracting outstanding African American faculty to Meharry has been the presence of clear opportunities for growth and development along career ladders into leadership positions. On the one hand, it has been clear that these faculty persons were greatly needed and, on the other hand, it has been clear that the opportunity for them to play significant leadership roles in the faculty and at the institution are present. These two factors should in fact be present for minority faculty at any institution which is serious about enhancing the presence of minority faculty on its campus as well as in higher education in general.

This perspective assumes that if an institution does not desperately need to improve and/or increase its minority faculty, it certainly has not the commitment to provide clear opportunities to support and motivate minority students. By the same token, if an institution has made minority student recruitment and success a priority, then that institution should clearly provide unique opportunities for minority faculty to develop. Thus, short-term (faculty recruitment) and long-term (student recruitment) strategies come together. They are not only interconnected but are inseparable. Certainly one of the major reasons an institution should be successful in recruiting and retaining minority faculty is that it has a clear long-range commitment to produce more minorities who will be faculty in the future.

An important element in Meharry's success is a system of incentives and rewards, which plays an important role in faculty recruitment.

### The Role of Incentives and Rewards

Incentives and rewards play an important role in faculty recruitment. In the long term, if higher education institutions



108

and/or departments are to become seriously involved with increasing minority faculty, there must be clear incentives and rewards. Funds need to be available for faculty to develop professionally, to provide for new opportunities and options for growth and change. For example, faculty need released time to participate in conferences, seminars and workshops. If there are visible and direct ties to the reward system and/or tangible encouragement, faculty generally display greater interest in new thrusts and increased responsibilities and cooperation. It is quite clear that institutions, departments, and faculty members vigorously pursue those interests for which they are rewarded, whether they relate to programming, teaching or research. The salary scale is an important factor. Another way for colleges and universities to reward faculty and create incentives is to increase the salaries and to provide tenure and promotion.

With the demographic changes that are occurring in our society with regard to ethnic-racial groups, it is expected that over the next decade much of the work of faculty development will be linked to the issues of student development. Therefore, diversity in student backgrounds and student preparation are becoming important issues. Thus, a practical approach in the 1990s will be the development of appropriate incentives and rewards for faculty.

## Conclusion

Because heterogeneity or diversity within the structure of an institution of higher learning is the key to resolving problems that arise from the underrepresentation of diverse ethnic/racial perspective (or avoiding those problems before they arise), and because minority faculty members have such potential for resolving potential or actual conflict, we urge institutions to diversify their faculties by recruiting minority faculty. A working model for this diversification exists at Meharry Medical College; a similar program, together with a practical system of incentives and rewards, will contribute greatly to eliminating racial incidents on campus and produce a culturally more pluralistic campus community.

## Notes

[1]*One-Third of a Nation: A Report of the Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life.* American Council on Education and Education Commission of the States, 1988.

[2]*Changing America: The New Face of Science and Engineering.* The Task Force on Women, Minorities, and the Handicapped in Science and Technology, September 1988, p. 3.

[3]Dale Nitzschke, President, Marshall University "Memorandum to West Virginia Governor Gaston Caperton" September 11, 1989.

[4]*The New Agenda of Women for Higher Education: A Report of the ACE Commission on Women in Higher Education.* 1987, p. 3.

[5]*Strategies for Improving the Status of Blacks in Post-Secondary Education: Selected Proceedings, Illinois Committee on Black Concerns in Higher Education,* vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1985, pp 63-64.

[6]"Large Shortage of Black Professors in Higher Education Grows Worse." *The Wall Street Journal,* October 1984; see also "Blacks in Higher Education: The Climb Towards Equality." *Change,* May/June 1987; see also *Certainty of Opportunity: A Report on the NASFAA/ACE Symposium on Early Awareness of Postsecondary Education.* July 1989. p. 2; see also *Annual Status Report on Minorities in Education.* Office of Minority Concerns, The American Council on Education, 1988; see also Robert Atwell, "Minority Participation in Higher Education: We Need a New Momentum." Remarks delivered at the ACE Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., January 1988.

Madeleine Green, Editor, *Minorities on Campus: A Handbook for Enhancing Diversity.* American Council on Education.

*Achieving Faculty Diversity: A Source book of Ideas and Success Stories.* University of Wisconsin System, 1988.

*The University of California in the Twenty-First Century: Successful Approaches to Faculty Diversity,* Spring 1987.

Arturo Madrid, "Quality and Diversity," *AAHE Bulletin,* June 1988.

# Suppression and Controls on American College Campuses

David S. Tatel
Attorney-at-Law

*A feature of the Washington meeting of university presidents exploring the problems of racial and ethnic violence on America's campuses was the luncheon address of attorney David Tatel, a national authority on the legal aspects of free speech, partner in the law firm of Hogan and Hartson, and Director of the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1977-1979.*

*In our dedication to preserve and protect the rights and opportunities of minorities in our collegiate institutions, our zeal may lead us toward the suppression of the American constitutional privilege to voice opinions, beliefs, and convictions freely and without restraint.*

*Mr. Tatel's observations are a cautionary and sobering reminder of the responsibilities of universities to respect the established laws of the nation as they try to restrain ethnic and racial harrassment.*

*Mr. Tatel has edited the taped copy of his luncheon speech for this publication.*

When I was asked to speak here today, I planned to describe the extent to which the First Amendment to the Constitution imposes limits on the ability of a public college or university to deal with racially offensive and demeaning speech. The more I thought about the issues, however, the more it seemed to me that this approach would not be particularly helpful. Although I have my own views, the truth is that the precise scope of the First Amendment and its applicability to the important issue of offensive and demeaning speech on campus are unsettled. There are as many views on the subject as there are people who have addressed it. In the end, we cannot have a definitive legal resolution until the Supreme Court rules on this difficult issue.

For these reasons, I thought it would be more helpful to suggest how colleges and universities can approach this difficult and growing problem of racial harassment on campus in a way that avoids a First Amendment controversy altogether, or at least minimizes one if it occurs. Whether a university's view of the First Amendment is broad or narrow, a strategy designed to minimize conflict with it makes sense for several reasons.

For one thing, academic freedom is itself protected by the First Amendment; the university ought to be the last institution in society that imposes limits on it. This is particularly true when

those limits are imposed in the name of equal educational opportunity, since the civil rights movement has itself been conducted under the protective umbrella of the First Amendment. Finally, clashes with the First Amendment are quite likely to result in litigation which will be both divisive and, particularly if an institution loses, expensive.

Before summarizing my suggestions for avoiding a conflict with the First Amendment, I want to make three points. First, the First Amendment applies only to public institutions. Some private institutions, however, are subject to similar principles of freedom of expression either because state law contains such guarantees or because they have incorporated such guarantees in their catalogs and publications.

Second, although I will be referring to racial harassment throughout this talk, my comments are equally applicable to harassment based on sex, ethnicity, or disability.

Finally, and most important, my suggestion that the First Amendment imposes limits on the power of public universities to punish offensive and demeaning speech should not be interpreted as an indication that I do not believe that the problem is not serious. To the contrary, my own view is that racial harassment is a growing problem on our campuses that is causing grave and serious harm to minority students. It is a problem that demands the immediate attention of college presidents and boards of trustees. At the same time, it must be approached with a clear understanding of the First Amendment, for as Justice Black has said:

> *I do not believe that it can be too often repeated that the freedoms . . . guaranteed by the First Amendment must be accorded to the ideas we hate or sooner or later they will be denied to the ideas we cherish.*

### I. Analysis of the Need for a Policy

My first suggestion is that before dashing off a racial harassment policy, a university should ask itself whether it really needs one. The reason for asking this question is that federal law—and in many parts of the country, state law—punishes racially motivated interference with constitutional and statutory

rights, including the right to attend public universities or private universities that receive federal funds. These laws carry both criminal and civil sanctions. Several states have laws that prohibit any form of racial harassment, and in other states, victims of racial harassment can recover damages for emotional injury.

These statutes are, of course, quite narrow. They prohibit only the most egregious forms of racial harassment and intimidation. But depending upon the particular circumstances on campus, a university might find that it can satisfy its needs by relying on existing criminal and civil law. For this reason, before a university drafts a racial harassment policy, it should examine the key federal laws carefully and determine whether relevant state law provides additional criminal and civil sanctions. If it does not, it may want to consider whether seeking state legislation would solve the problem on its campus.

The advantages of this course of action are twofold. First, it will keep the university out of the business of regulating speech and thus avoid any conflict between university policy and the First Amendment altogether. Second, I cannot think of a more effective way to signal to the university community that racial harassment is unacceptable than by treating it as a criminal offense.

There are, of course, disadvantages to this approach. Criminal and civil law may not be sufficiently broad to cover the types of behavior that are occurring on campus. Also, some believe that universities ought to regulate themselves, and bringing law enforcement officers on campus is inconsistent with that autonomy.

I do not know whether the advantages of this course of action outweigh the disadvantages on any particular campus. That is a question each university will have to decide for itself. My only point is that this is a decision a university ought to make before it writes its own racial harassment policy that could precipitate a serious conflict with the First Amendment.

### II. Understanding First Amendment Principles

Universities that believe they need a racial harassment policy should make sure their policy is both narrow and clear. Let me first address the question of narrowness.

Before a university begins to write a racial harassment policy, it needs to understand certain basic First Amendment principles. The most important is that the First Amendment prohibits public entities from punishing speech, except for certain very narrowly limited classes of speech such as obscenity, libel, slander, and what are known as "fighting words"—those that are directed at an individual and are likely to cause the average person to retaliate and precipitate a breach of the peace. Courts have allowed public entities to regulate the "time, place and manner" of speech, provided the limitations are narrow and content neutral.

In recent years, the Supreme Court has carved out an additional exception to the First Amendment that gives elementary and secondary schools broad discretion to regulate student expressive activities that are curriculum-related. This exception, however, does not apply to colleges and universities, which the Supreme Court has repeatedly held are not "immune from the sweep of the First Amendment."

The Supreme Court's latest First Amendment decision—last term's flag-burning case—is worth reading because, although it was controversial, Justice Brennan's majority opinion was quite traditional in its application of First Amendment doctrine and illustrates the importance of ensuring that racial harassment policies be as narrow as possible. The Court ruled that expressive conduct—burning an American flag—is entitled to the same First Amendment protection as is accorded to ordinary speech, and that it cannot be punished merely because the state disagrees with the views that are expressed. The decision is particularly worth reading because, in a comment directly related to the subject of this conference, Justice Brennan said that society cannot prohibit the expression of an idea or punish it merely because society finds the idea to be offensive or disagreeable. The First Amendment, he said, does not "guarantee that other concepts virtually sacred to our Nation as a whole—such as the principle that discrimination on the basis of race is odious and destructive—will go unquestioned in the marketplace of ideas."

Notwithstanding the Supreme Court's very narrow and very consistent interpretation of the First Amendment, the increased level of racial harassment on campus has led some colleges and

universities to argue for more authority to regulate offensive speech. The primary argument is that the university community is different from society as a whole, that it is an academic, collegial institution, and that its primary responsibility is to protect the integrity of the academic process. Because of this, it is argued, universities can punish offensive and demeaning speech that interferes with the integrity of the academic process even though that speech might be protected by the First Amendment outside the university community.

A second argument for giving universities greater authority to regulate speech is that universities have a legitimate interest in promoting racial diversity on campus and a responsibility to maintain a harmonious community and protect minority students from discrimination on the basis of race. That responsibility, it is argued, also gives the institution authority to punish racist speech that might otherwise be protected by the First Amendment.

A third argument is that racist speech is so damaging to the victim that, like obscenity, it can be prohibited outright. This argument would apply on or off campus.

Many well-intentioned people believe that these arguments have merit. Indeed, some universities have used these arguments to justify policies that penalize speech that interferes with "the learning environment." Others strongly disagree with these arguments and believe that the courts will not accept them as a basis for creating an additional exception to the First Amendment. As I said at the outset, I do not intend to try to resolve this debate. The important point is that the courts have not yet accepted any of these arguments. This means that a university that relies on them as a basis for its racial harassment policy is venturing into unchartered waters and running the risk that its policy will be challenged in court. Depending on the particular circumstances on campus, a university may be prepared to run that risk, but before it does, it at least ought to examine whether a narrow approach might satisfy its needs.

I have already mentioned using existing federal and state laws. If those do not satisfy a university's needs, an institution should consider the possibility of basing a racial harassment policy on the well-accepted "fighting words" exception to the First

Amendment. This would allow a university to punish offensive or demeaning speech that is likely to cause retaliation or breach of the peace.

If that approach is too narrow, a university should consider the possibility of prohibiting offensive or demeaning speech that is aimed at an individual and that is intended to cause direct, immediate, and serious injury—i.e., one-on-one racial epithets. Although the courts have generally ruled that even racial epithets are protected by the First Amendment, at least to the extent that they do not amount to "fighting words," my own view is that a narrowly drafted policy that prohibits one-on-one racial epithets might well survive constitutional scrutiny in the context of the college campus. Racial epithets advance none of the purposes of the First Amendment, they cause serious injury, and they can disrupt the learning environment. The courts might accept such a narrowly drafted racial harassment policy as a rational compromise of a difficult problem, particularly if the university pursues other suggestions that follow.

I want to emphasize that I am not saying that a racial harassment policy that penalizes only one-on-one racial epithets will survive constitutional challenge. I am saying only that it has a good chance of doing so, and that it certainly has a better chance than the broader regulations that many universities are now adopting.

The point of all of this, of course, is that the narrower a university's policy, the closer the policy sticks to punishing only one-on-one racial epithets, the less likely the university will be sued and the more likely it will win if it is.

In addition to drawing a racial harassment policy narrowly, a university also should be sure that the policy is as clear as possible.

The reason for this is that regardless of how narrow the university intends its policy to be, if the language is not clear and if it could be interpreted to punish protected as well as unprotected speech, the courts will likely invalidate it.

For this reason, the language of the policy should be crystal clear. All written and oral interpretations and explanations of the policy should be equally clear. And finally, a university should

make sure that the policy is applied consistently and only to unprotected activities.

The overall message a university should send to a reviewing court is that the campus clearly understands the policy and that it can be applied only to speech that is not protected by the First Amendment.

Before turning to my third suggestion, I want to emphasize that although the First Amendment may limit a university's power to punish certain kinds of speech, it in no way limits the university's ability to condemn racial harassment in the strongest possible terms. Nothing in the First Amendment prohibits the university from harnessing all of its educational and communicative resources in the battle against racial harassment and racial discrimination.

### III. Focus

My next suggestion derives from the English teacher's old adage that one cannot write clearly about a subject that one does not clearly understand. This principle applies equally to the drafting of racial harassment policies: before a university writes a policy, it is important for it to focus on precisely what it wants to prohibit.

Most universities have approached the problem the other way around: they begin by writing the policy before they completely understand the types of speech they want to prohibit. As a consequence, the language is usually overboard and vague, and there is little consensus on campus as to its meaning.

A better approach is to focus first on the types of speech a university wants to penalize. Once it reaches agreement on this, it will be relatively easy to write a policy that punishes only the speech it wants to discourage. Not only is this likely to result in a policy that is narrow and clear, but it will demonstrate to a reviewing court that the university approached the issue carefully and with sensitivity to the limits of the First Amendment.

### IV. Consensus Building

Do not write the policy in the administration building. Instead, let the policy evolve from a process that includes all elements of the university community.

For example, an institution should consider establishing a committee consisting of faculty, administrators, and students, and directing it to hold two sets of hearings. The first should be a fact-finding hearing. All interested organizations and individuals should be invited to testify on the extent of racial harassment on campus. Include testimony from constitutional scholars on the limits of the First Amendment.

The committee should make findings on the basis of these hearings and summarize them in a public report. The report should include the committee's findings regarding racial harassment on campus, its recommendations regarding the need for a racial harassment policy, and a proposed racial harassment policy if the committee feels that one is necessary.

After the campus has had time to discuss and debate the report, the committee should hold a second hearing to which all interested individuals and organizations are invited to testify about the report and its recommendations. Following the second set of hearings, the committee should issue a final report to the president and board of trustees.

There are several very important reasons for proceeding this way. First, it will discipline the process by focusing on the behavior the university wants to prohibit rather than on the language of the policy. This will contribute to the development of a narrow and clear policy that will make it more defensible. The process will also enhance the policy's defensibility because it will demonstrate to a reviewing court that the policy was not imposed on the university community by a small group of administrators, but rather evolved from a process that included all elements of the academic community.

Second, the process will serve an important educational function. It will give everyone on campus a better understanding of the scope and nature of racial harassment and of the damage that it can inflict. It will also give the campus a better understanding of the limits of the First Amendment.

Third, the process will give all concerned a greater degree of confidence in the policies and in their related procedures, thus reducing the chances that they will be challenged in court, and increasing the likelihood that victims of harassment will actually use them. Those who have studied racial disorders on campus

have found that they occur, at least in part, because students did not utilize existing university procedures because they were not involved in their development and therefore lacked confidence in them.

**V. Comprehensive Response**

My final suggestion is that a university's response to the problem of racial harassment must be broader and more comprehensive than written policies penalizing racist speech. A racial harassment policy, if one is needed at all, should be only part of a comprehensive response to the problem. Colleges and universities throughout the country, many of which are represented in this room today, have developed a variety of programs designed to prevent racial harassment from occurring and to deal with it when it does. These programs include counseling, mediation, improved communication, education, and strengthened efforts to hire minority faculty and administrators.

There are, of course, strong policy reasons for developing comprehensive programs of this kind. There are also compelling legal reasons for doing so. Like the procedures I suggested earlier, including racial harassment policies as only part of a comprehensive program will help to discipline the process by ensuring that the policies are narrowly drawn to deal with only the most egregious types of harassment. This approach will also make the policies more defensible by demonstrating to a reviewing court that the university is trying to deal with the underlying causes of the problem rather than simply penalizing speech.

One final point: while it is important to ensure that the university's response to the problem of racial harassment is comprehensive and includes both educational programs and racial harassment policies, it is equally important to ensure that the university does not use its educational programs as sanctions against those who have participated in activities protected by the First Amendment. Some universities seem to believe that First Amendment problems can be avoided if students who engage in racial harassment, instead of being punished, are required to attend educational programs or to apologize to their victims. This belief is wrong if a reviewing court subsequently determines that the speech in question was protected by the First Amendment. If

it was, the university cannot impose any sanction, even one as mild as education or counseling.

I hope these suggestions are helpful, although I am the first to acknowledge that it is much easier for me to stand here in Washington advising you on how to avoid a conflict with the First Amendment than it is for you to return to campus and actually accomplish it.

That reminds me of an old story about Will Rogers. During World War II, Rogers appeared before a congressional committee and testified that he knew how to end the war in the North Atlantic. The way to end that war, he said, was to bring the Atlantic Ocean to a boil, which would in turn force the German U-boats to surface where they could be destroyed by American warships. The chairman of the committee told Rogers that he thought that was quite an intriguing idea, but asked him how he intended to bring the Atlantic Ocean to a boil. "I haven't thought about that," said Rogers, "but I am sure there are experts in the War Department who will know how to do it."



121

# The First Amendment and Racial Harassment on Campus

A Selective Bibliography

David Tatel
Jane Bulbin
Barbara Burch
Hogan & Hartson

## Bibliography

### Articles

Bernstein, "On Campus, How Free Should Free Speech Be?," *New York Times*, 10 Sept., 1989. Sec. 4, p. 5, col. 1.

Bhirdo, "The Liability and Responsibility of Institutions of Higher Education for the On-Campus Victimization of Students," *Journal of College and University Law*, 16:119.

Bowen, "Wrong Message from Academe; Colleges, Say Blacks, Are Doing Too Little Too Late about Racism," *Time*, 6 April, 1987.

Brodie, "No, We're Not Taught to Hate; But We Can Overcome Instinct to Fear 'The Other'" *Los Angeles Times*, 9 Sept., 1989, Metro Section, Part 2, p. 8, col. 3 (Adaption of speech to 1989 incoming first year class at Duke University).

Browne-Wilkinson, "Racial Descrimination: The Role of the Civil Law," *Current Legal Problems*, 41:238.

Delgado, "Words that Wound: A Tort Action for Racial Insults, Epithets, and Name-Calling," *Harvard Civil Rights—Civil Liberties Law Review*, 17:133.

Fields, "Colleges Advised to Develop Strong Procedures to Deal with Incidents of Racial Harassment," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 34:11.

Finn, Jr., "The Campus: 'An Island of Repression in a Sea of Freedom,'" *Commentary*, 18:17.

"Freedom of Expression and Racial Harassment on Campus," Synthesis: *Law and Policy in Higher Education*, No. 1, Jan. 1989.

Hamilton, "The View From: Trinity College; A College Takes Steps to Combat Racism on Campus," *New York Times*, 17 Sept., 1989, p. 2, col.1.

Holman, "Racial, Religious Hate: Is it Growing?" *Human Rights*, 15:23.

Howard, "Extremism on Campus: Symbols of Hate, Symbols of Hope," *Christian Century*, 15 July, 1987, p. 625.

Kretzmer, "Freedom of Speech and Racism," *Cardozo Law Review*, 8:445.

Lasson, "Racial Defamation as Free Speech: Abusing the First Amendment," *Columbia Human Rights Law Review*, No. 17, p. 11.

Lawrence, "When Racism Dresses in Speech's Clothing: Reconciling the First and Fourteenth Amendments." June 1987, (prepared for a plenary session at the 1987 Biennial Conference; University of Wisconsin, Madison).

Matsuda, "Public Response to Racist Speech: Considering the Victim's Story," *Michigan Law Review* 87:2320.

McConnell, "Campus Controversy; Blacks and Whites, II-Columbia University," *New Republic*, 25 May, 1987.

Rogers, "Deindividuation and Aggression—Role of Models, Insult, and Victims Race, Personality *and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1980, No. 196.

Shea, "'Don't Bother to Smile When You Call Me That—Fighting Words and the First Amendment," *Kentucky Law Journal*, 1975, No. 63.

Sowell, "New Racism on Campus," *Fortune*, 13 Feb., 1989, p. 115.

Tifft, "Bigots in the Ivory Tower; Racial, Religious and Sexual Prejudice Make a Campus Comeback," *Time*, Jan. 23, 1989.

"Universities; Racism, Cynicism, Musical Chairs," *The Economist*, 25 June 1988.

Williams, "Campus Racism; Race, Scholarship, and Affirmative Action," *National Review*, 1989; No. 41.

Wilson, "Fire This Time—Effects of Race of Target, Insult, and Potential Retaliation on Black Agression," Journal *of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1975, No. 32.

Wong, "Anti-Asian Violence," *Forum*, (newsletter of the National Institute Against Prejudice & Violence) 4:2.

Workman, "College Student Graffiti: Clues to Student Needs, Conflicts, Frustrations and Preoccupations," 1983 (presented at Fall Meeting of the California College Personnel Association, Asilomar, CA).

**Resources**

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, "ADL Model Statute: Ethnic Vandalism and Intimidation," contained in *ADL Law Report—Legislation*, 1985:8.

National Institute Against Prejudice & Violence, *Campus Ethnoviolence: The Policy Options*, Institute Report No. 4, May 1989.

National Institute Against Prejudice & Violence, *Prejudice and Violence: An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Materials on Ethnoviolence*, April 1989.

National Institute Against Prejudice & Violence, *Striking Back at Bigotry: Remedies Under Federal and State Law for Violence Motivated by Racial, Religious and Ethnic Prejudice and 1988 Supplement*, prepared by Hogan and Hartson Attorneys and the Washington, D.C. Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, 1986 & 1988.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "Bigotry and Violence on College Campuses," conference held by the Commission, May 18, 1989, Washington, D.C. (report in progress.)

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Intimidation and Violence. *Racial and Religious Bigotry in America*, Clearinghouse Publ. No. 77, 1983.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Recent Activities Against Citizens and Residents of Asian Descent*, Clearinghouse Publ. No. 88, 1987.

Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, *Civil and Criminal Remedies for Racially and Religiously Motivated Violence*, June 1983.

**Cases**

Adamian v. Jacobsen, 523 F.2d 929 (9th Cir. 1975), cert. denied sub nom.

*Adamian v. Lombardi*, 446 U.S. 938 (1980).

*Albert v. Carovano*, 824 F.2d 1333 (2d cir.), *modified by*, 839 F.2d 871 (2d Cir. 1987), *aff'd in part en banc*, 851 F.2d 561 (2d Cir. 1988).

*Auburn Alliance for Peace and Justice v. Martin*, 684 F. Supp 1072 (M.D. Ala.), *aff'd*, 853 F.2d 931 (1988).

*Berg v. Hunter*, 854 F.2d 238 (7th cir. 1988), *cert. denied*, 109 S. Ct. 1314 (1989).

*Bethel School District No. 403 v. Fraser*, 478 U.S. 675 (1986).

*Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296 (1940).

*Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire*, 315 U.S. 568 (1942).

*Cohen v. California*, 403 U.S. 15 (1971).

*Doe v. University of Michigan*, No.89-71683 (E.D. Mich. Sept.

7, 1989) (Order granting permanent injunction with excerpt of hearing on motion for preliminary injunction).

*Gay Alliance of Students v. Matthews*, 544 F.2d 162 (4th Cir. 1976).

*Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier*, 484 U.S. 260 (1988).

*Healy v. James*, 408 U.S. 169 (1972).

*Olesen v. Board of Education*, 676 F. Supp. 820 (N.D. Ill.1987).

*Martin v. Parrish*, 805 F.2d 583 (5th Cir. 1986).

*Papish v. University of Missouri Curators*, 410 U.S. 667 (1973).

*Piarowski v. Illinois Community College District* 515, 759 F.2d 625 (7th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1007 (1985).

*Russ v. White*, 541 F. Supp. 888 (W.D. Ark. 1981), aff'd, 680 F.2d 47 (8th Cir. 1982).

*Shamloo v. Mississippi State Board of Trustees*, 620 F.2d 516 (5th Cir. 1980).

*Students Against Apartheid Coalition v. O'Neil*, 671 F. Supp. 1105 (W.D. Va. 1987), *aff'd*, 838 F. 2d 735 (4th Cir. 1988).

*Terminiello v. Chicago*, 337 U.S. 1 (1949).

*Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District*, 393 U.S. 503 (1969).

*University of Utah Students Against Apartheid v. Peterson*, 649 F. Supp. 1200 (D. Utah 1986).

*Vietnamese Fishermen's Association v. Knights of the Ku Klux Klan*, 518 F. Supp. 993 (S.D. Tex. 1981).

*Widmar v. Vincent*, 454 U.S. 263 (1981).

## Now Liberals are Censors

George Will
Columnist

*In his essay of Sunday, November 5, 1989, syndicated columnist George Will viewed the problems of restricted speech on the nation's college campuses from a social and political perspective that serves as a corollary to Mr. Tatel's concern for the recognition of current law and the preservation of constitutional freedom. Mr. Will's column is copyrighted, 1989, by* The Washington Post *Writers Group and is reprinted here with permission.*

Two years ago, Prof. Charles Lawrence of Stanford law school produced a scholarly essay of 31 pages, 62 footnotes and one weird idea. It was that the real purport and proper effect of the Supreme Court's 1954 school-desegregation decision is to permit, and perhaps require, sweeping censorship of speech.

Lawrence argued that the Court found segregated schools inherently unequal and unconstitutional because of "the message" of inferiority that segregation conveys. Therefore it is constitutional to suppress speech with a racist message.

It is but a short step—via the manufacture of yet another right (the right to respect)—to the notion that the Constitution sanctions suppression of all speech offensive to any of America's "traditionally subjugated groups" or "victims." Only one group is ineligible for the privileged status of victim: There can be no limits on speech about white males. Speech that liberals disapprove should be suppressed because it expresses ideas that are "culturally engendered" by America's sick society.

Were Lawrence's argument merely one man's eccentricity, it would not matter. However, it exemplifies the ongoing attempt to give intellectual respectability to the spreading movement of censorship by liberals on campuses.

Many colleges and universities have adopted stringent codes stipulating impermissible speech. Such codes often come in a package with mandatory "awareness" classes. These are inflicted by sensitivity-tutors and other official consciousness-raisers. Their task is to make students "aware" of officially approved thinking about race, "sexual preference" and other items of liberal orthodoxy.

The proliferating rules proscribe speech that "slurs" or "stereotypes" or "stigmatizes" or "victimizes." The rules forbid giving offense to any group enjoying the coveted status of victim. The University of Michigan's rule (which a judge laughed out of court) forbade all speech giving offense "on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, creed, ancestry, age, marital status, handicap or Vietnam-era veteran status."

Many such codes strikingly resemble something that recently enraged liberals: Sen. Jesse Helms' amendment to prohibit federal funding of art that "denigrates, debases or reviles a person, group or class of citizens on the basis of race, creed, sex, handicap, age or national origin." "Tyranny!" exclaimed some liberals who, pausing over their lengthening lists of forbidden forms of speech, declared that denial of a subsidy constitutes censorship.

Prof. Alan Kors of the University of Pennsylvania shrewdly notes that in the 1960s, when most students seemed to the left of faculty and administrations, liberals said: It is illegitimate for universities to assert moral authority over students. But today, most students seem to be to the right of the academic establishment, so liberalism encourages that establishment to control ("raise") the consciousness of retrograde students caught deviating from liberal orthodoxy.

More than at any time in memory, there are many subjects "too sensitive" to talk about freely on campuses that are patrolled by prowling sensitivity police. Courses on, for example, the history or sociology of race can be considered too problematic to undertake. This is a broader threat to freedom than the liberal mobs that howled down speakers supporting the U.S. commitment to Vietnam. It has more of a "chilling effect" than McCarthyism did because today the forces of censorship arise from within the academic culture.

The censorship that liberals like might seem especially odd in an era of permissiveness regarding curricula. But the permissiveness is itself a ploy in the liberals' struggle to politicize the curricula by ending the "domination" by DWEMs—dead white European males.

Liberals have been First Amendment fanatics (All forms of expression are of equal value-who is to say otherwise?) for a long time. Therefore, only conservatives can make the case for the kernel of truth in what the liberals are saying. Conservatives can say:

An academic community is not a haphazard aggregation of individuals. Rather, it is a community, a complex, fragile organism with distinctive purposes. Fulfillment of those purposes requires a particular atmosphere of civility that can be incompatible with unrestricted expression.

Liberals, however, have long preached universal disdain for all authority, intellectual as well as political. Having asserted that tolerance is the only obvious value, they are singularly unsuited to digging their heels into the academic soil that liberalism has made marshy.

In attempting to temper individualism with communitarian concerns, academic liberals are asserting a right they ferociously deny to every other community—local,state or national: the right to defend community values by circumscribing individual rights.

Among today's academic list-makers, listing all the forms of forbidden speech, are there any who defend the right of the national community to nurture its values by limiting the "symbolic speech" of flag desecration? Any who defend a community's right to defend its standards against pornography? Imagine the incredulity quickly becoming outrage, if anyone suggested campus restrictions on speech slandering the United States.

The grim administrators of moral uplift at the University of Connecticut are empowered to punish students for "inappropriately directed laughter." Derisive laughter directed at the liberal censors is appropriate.

# Appendix

Participants in the Forum on
The President's Role in Creating A Healthy
Campus Racial and Ethnic Climate

October 10-11, 1989
Washington, DC

William M. Anderson, Jr.
President
Mary Washington College
Fredericksburg, VA

Louis M. Barsi*
Program Associate,
Academic Programs
AASCU
Washington, DC

Connie Belms*
Executive Assistant to the President
University of Maryland,
Baltimore County
Baltimore, MD

J. Herman Blake
Vice Chancellor
Indiana University, Purdue
University of Indianapolis
Indianapolis, IN

Anthony F. Ceddia
President
Shippensburg University
Shippensburg, PA

President William H. Chace
Wesleyan University
Middletown, CT

Sister Eileen Currie
President
Cabrini College
Radnor, PA

Joseph Duffey
Chancellor
University of Massachusetts—
Amherst
Amherst, MA

Edward B. Fort
Chancellor
North Carolina Agricultural
and Technical University
Greensboro, NC

James E. Gilbert
President
East Stroudsburg University
of Pennsylvania
East Stroudsburg, PA

Elsa Gomez
President
Kean College of New Jersey
Union, NJ

Sheldon Hackney
President
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA

Robert D. Hebert
President
McNeese State University
Lake Charles, LA

Robert L. Hess
President
City University of New York,
Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, NY

Wilbur Hicks*
Assistant Vice President
for Student Affairs
University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Baltimore, MD

Evelyn Hively
Vice President
for Academic Programs
AASCU
Washington, DC

Robert Hively
Consultant
AASCU
Washington, DC

Michael K. Hooker
President
University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Baltimore, MD

Leon Howard
President
Alabama State University
Montgomery, AL

Eugene M. Hughes
President
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ

Jimmy R. Jenkins
Chancellor
Elizabeth City State University
Elizabeth City, NC

Lawrence Johnson*
Director of Human Relations
Programs
University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Baltimore, MD

D. Bruce Johnstone
Chancellor
State University of New York
Albany, NY

Susan Kitchen*
Vice President for Student Affairs
University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Baltimore, MD

Judith Kruger*
Conciliation Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Philadelphia, PA

John E. LaTourette
President
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL

David E. McFarland
President
Kutztown University
of Pennsylvania
Kutztown, PA

Haskell M. Monroe
Chancellor
University of Missouri-Columbia
Columbia, MO

Dale F. Nitzschke
President
Marshall University
Huntington, WV

Allan W. Ostar
President
AASCU
Washington, DC

Blandina Ramirez
Director, Office of Minority Concerns
American Council on Education
Washington, DC

Nilda Rendino*
Assistant Director, Academic
Programs
AASCU
Washington, DC

Earl S. Richardson
President
Morgan State University
Baltimore, MD

James M. Rosser
President
California State University, Los
Angeles
Los Angeles, CA

Leo Sayavedra
President
Laredo State University
Laredo, TX

Kenneth A. Shaw
President
University of Wisconsin System
Madison, WI

Mary L. Smith
President
Kentucky State University
Frankfort, KY

David S. Tatel
Attorney-at-Law
Hogan and Hartson
Washington, DC

Adele Dutton Terrell*
Program Director
National Institute Against
Prejudice and Violence
Baltimore, MD

Walter Washington
President
Alcorn State College
Lorman, MS

Joan Weiss*
Director
National Institute Against
Prejudice and Violence
Baltimore, MD

John D. Welty
President
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, PA

Craig Dean Willis
President
Lock Haven University
of Pennsylvania
Lock Haven, PA

*Member-Forum Planning Group

American Association of State
Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-1192
Allan W. Ostar, President

4/90 • Code 306